Reform Movements in Behalf of Children in England of the Early Nineteenth Century, and the Agents of Those Reforms

By
ISABEL SIMERAL, M.A.

NEW YORK
1916

IDEAL
BOOKSTORE
1125 Amsterdam Ave.
Opp. Columbia Univ.
New York 25, N. Y.

Reform Movements in Behalf of Children in England of the Early Nineteenth Century, and the Agents of Those Reforms

By
ISABEL SIMERAL, M.A.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
HV
751
.A6
S5
1916
54,232

NEW YORK
1916

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. Introduction 5

II. Child Chimney Sweeps in England, 1788-1875 17
1. The Struggle for Prohibitive Legislation 17
2. The Antecedents of the Promoters of the Legislation 30

III. Factory Legislation in Behalf of Children, 1800-1853 35
1. The Struggle for Prohibitive Legislation 35
a. Introduction 35
b. The Bill of 1802 39
c. The Bill of 1819 40
d. The Bill of 1825 44
e. The Amendment of 1831 45
f. The Struggle for the Ten Hour Bill 48
g. The Bill of 1844 which restricted the labor of children between eight and thirteen years, to a six and one half hour day 61
2. The Antecedents of the Chief Promoters of Factory Laws for Children 70

IV. Robert Owen and New Lanark 73
1. The Institution and Its Background 73
2. The Sources of the Principles which Expressed Themselves in the New Lanark Institution 103

V. The Emancipation of Women and Girls from Labor in the Mines and Collieries of the British Isles, and Restrictions in the Employment of Boys 105
1. The Process of Securing Prohibitive Legislation 105
2. The Promoters of that Legislation 119

VI. The Newgate Prison Schools and Their Development 120
1. The Origin and Development of the Schools 120
2. The Antecedents of These Agents in Prison Reform 155

VII. Anglican Promotion of Education for the Children of the Poor in the Early Nineteenth Century in England,—Its Antecedents, Its Setting, and Its Interpretation 156
Introduction 156
1. The Charity Schools of the Anglican Church 158
2. The Lancaster-Bell Controversy 181
3. The Beginnings of Parliamentary Agitation and the Creation of the National Society 190
4. The Revival of Parliamentary Agitation and the First Step in Government Interference in Popular Education 196
5. Promoters of Popular Education 211

VIII. Conclusion 212

IX. Bibliography 214

I

INTRODUCTION

The word "reform" has enjoyed a varied and checkered career. First employed to signify a sense of moral awakening due to religious conviction, or a widely diffused change born of religious power and authority, the restrictions of its present usage are ill-defined. It has served as an alias. Its standards have sheltered both men ready to labor and to die for ideals, and men who have utilized its banners as the cloak of hypocrisy, as the screen for personal knavery.

However that may be, reform leaders are none the less generic members of that radical fraternity to whose services due recognition is just now beginning to be paid.[1] By the protests of the radical, the smugly inert, indifferent are compelled to realize that conditions are not always well merely because chance or precedent permits their long existence, and that a world running on *laisser faire* principles, does not necessarily evolve the highest good nor the greatest happiness to the members of the social body. Even the extravagances and insecurities with which the doctrines of the radical are sometimes fraught, oblige men to challenge both ancient custom and "instinctive" impulse, and to take upon themselves the stern discipline of reflection in the search for a determining principle of action.

The reformer, as such, is anomalous. His vision may be sharper than that of his contemporaries, his may be the only voice audible in open denunciation of things as they are, but in final analysis he is merely the chance determined spokesman of the many who have arrived at their common deductions almost simultaneously,—at judgments born of their environment, evoked by the economic, social, and political conditions of their day.

[1]James H. Robinson, *The New History,* New York, 1912, "The Spirit of Conservatism."

Before beginning an intensive scrutiny of the circumstances dominating certain reform movements in behalf of children, in the England of the early nineteenth century, and enquiring into the antecedents of the promoters of those reforms,—it is essential, therefore, to remind ourselves of the tremendous gulf separating twentieth century concepts of the child's place in society, from those familiar to earlier periods. In these days of mushroom development and kaleidoscopic change, the stronghold of yesterday's radicalism is but the portal of today's conservatism, and to attempt to apply the gauge of the twentieth century as the sole standard of measurement for previous eras, is to fail to grasp the significance of any specific period of civilization.

Concepts of the value and potencies of childhood, appreciation of its importance and inherent possibilities, fundamental elements in the relations of parent and child, even sensibility to the sufferings of child life, have varied from age to age, taking color, chameleon like, from the life of the day, and are manifestations of the social, economic and political conditions peculiar to the specific civilization of which they formed a part.

That the varying standards of the different eras have attained an equal degree of what we lightly term "civilization," no one will maintain; but if any estimate impartially just is to be sought, the conditions surrounding child life in any specific period must be weighed in the scales of the civilization of which they were an expression, not subjected to the misconstruction inevitable when judged entirely outside their original setting.

Not until the end of the nineteenth century was there any real distinction evident anywhere in the attitude of society toward child and toward adult. The ancient world, despite its emphasis upon the social setting of the individual, has nothing to intimate the close, familiar, and serious interest in children, the sentimental social atmosphere characteristic of the twentieth century; nothing to suggest adult activities pursued primarily for the well-being or pleasure of childhood.

The Middle Ages show the same failure to understand

essential differences. That which was deemed desirable in the adult, was deemed desirable in the child,—what was admirable in maturity was admirable in childhood. Due allowance was made for the weakness of the child body, for the immaturity of the child mind, but the nature of the tolerance was like that shown to the frail adult,—a difference in degree, not in kind, between child and man.

Extreme manifestation of interest in "other people's children" dates definitely from the very late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and is contemporary with the development of the "woman movement." That this fact is more than coincidence, that it is of fundamental significance, no student of the subject can deny. From the beginning of time, children—particularly girl children—have shared in the indifference and contempt and no less in the respect and reverence paid to womanhood. But as women have come to participate more fully in the rights, privileges, and labors of men, a new conception of childhood has been developed,—a conception for which men and women together are mutually responsible. It is the vision of all children, as the assets of the race, to be conserved at any cost,—as the torch bearers to the civilization of the future, as the links in the chain of human endeavor.

With this vision before mankind, the child has in our own day entered into his rights. For the first time in the history of the race he has become an entity in himself: his physical needs, his mental requirements, his moral training as considerations to be studied entirely apart from the adult. His life has become an autonomous world set within that of maturity.

Were this treatment of the child as a distinct social problem, an end in itself, there could not be found, even in the winsome helplessness of childhood, justification for the effort and sacrifice involved other than those of the parents who gave the child being. But there is a deeper significance than mere sentimentalism in the new conception of children. What has appeared to conservatives as a pleasant and kindly conspiracy to render youthful years as agreeable as possible, is in reality an enlarge-

ment of the social vision as to the perpetuation of its best, is the expression of society's desire to secure a possible immortality for the greatest and finest results it has achieved. The responsibility of bearing upward the standards of civilization, that responsibility which rests upon the adults of the future, is in direct ratio to the opportunities and advantages created for and afforded to the child of the present. Each generation leaves upon the shoulders of its successors a debt, honorable or otherwise, which must be discharged. And the means and methods employed and the results achieved in the discharge of that debt are the only true criterions by which a previous generation may be judged.

This concept of the child is the fundamental in what we of the twentieth century know as the "social idea." But it is not all. The world has learned that nothing of primary and permanent value may be accomplished for children, unless conditions are bettered for the adults with whom their lot is cast, that their interests are inseparably interwoven. To consider one group and ignore the other is to weaken the very foundations upon which all durable social structures must be reared. But, nevertheless, society is not blind to the fact that all that can be done for the adult of the present is, at best, a patching up,—that however essential and desirable reforms affecting adult life may be, the real secret of permanent human progress is not fundamentally antidote, but prevention. It is this recognition and not mere sentimentalism which has determined childhood as the field of promise in the struggle for social betterment.

The topics which have been selected for the body of this paper, with seeming arbitrariness, have been chosen in an effort to depict typical early nineteenth century activities[2] in behalf of children, to draw some conclusion as to what were the antecedents of the emotions which expressed themselves in the desire to benefit humanity, and to determine, if possible, what was the

---

[2]The topics include one representing Quaker activities, one showing an Anglican background, one expressing Deist conceptions and three dealing with remedial legislation which was due to men of varied antecedents.

origin of the conceptions which find expression to-day in the "social idea."

One conclusion, and one only, has been reached. No brief may be held for any one or any two sources of the passion for humanity. This social idea of the twentieth century is of synthetic genesis,—a creation some of whose elements date back to primitive Christianity, some to the pagan world. Its later development and modification have been primarily affected by the new angle of vision and vitalizing influence of the philosophic movement of the eighteenth century, and no less by the sense of brotherly responsibility and spiritual demands of the Evangelical movement. But these alone can not explain the new viewpoint. There are other vital elements which have entered into the creation of this concept. These elements are spiritual reactions from improved material conditions.

The vast wealth produced by developed industrialism since the eighteenth century, has not remained concentrated in the hands of a few, nor has the impoverishment of the proletariat been progressive, as Marx declared inevitable.[3] The number of the wealthy, the "comfortably off," and the "well-to-do" has increased tremendously since 1800 and with the dawn of the twentieth century the spiritual reaction from that material improvement is distinctly evident.

Men gripping the brutally dominant fact of poverty at close range have neither time nor opportunity for the development of the spiritual outlook necessary to produce any widespread concern over the state of their neighbors, or to conceive of themselves as parts in a whole whose entire well-being is a matter of vital, personal interest. Stern penury walls in their mental horizon. It is only with the removal of *poverty pressure* that the sight and understanding of manifest wretchedness impresses the ethical retina sufficiently to produce any altruistic desire for remedial action. Perverted religious sense has never permitted the world

---

[3]Cf. Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism,* "Ultimate Aim and Tendency," and V. G. Simkhovitch, *Marxism vs. Socialism,* Chap. vi.

to render to comfort and to happiness the honor that is their due as ethical and moralizing influences in the life of man.

The vast increase in wealth has made deep poverty, with its train of attendant ills, the more conspicuous—has framed it in contrasting comfort. The charitable impulse, moreover, is elemental and constantly fostered by the teachings of all religions, especially Christianity, has become a racial habit, so completely interwoven with the moral code that its source is somewhat obscured. The desire to relieve misery is not peculiar to any period, to any century, to any race or country or people,—it is practically instinctive in the human heart. But only in very recent years have men stopped to ask themselves seriously, why things were as they were, to consider what must be fundamentally wrong in conditions as they existed, how basic change could be effected and what results should accrue to the integral social body as well as to the group under immediate consideration, from successful attempts to realize these essential alterations.

It is in this that "the social idea" of the twentieth century stands entirely apart from all previous conceptions of humanitarianism, of the brotherhood of man, of philanthropy.

Until the time of the eighteenth century philosophes, all humanitarianism, whether private, under the direction of the Church or under that of the State (if the methods and workings of the English Poor Law may be called humanitarianism) was based solely on the motive of "pity" or "mercy." It was the duty of the fortunate to aid the unfortunate, of the rich to relieve the poor by "charity," of the superior to uplift the inferior. Very frequently the fulfillment of this duty was regarded as an insurance policy for future blessing and reward.

Few or no voices raised the question whether there was not something fundamentally wrong in a social system where the comfort and well-being of whole classes and groups of men depended entirely upon the mere accident of birth and the caprice or conscience of the more fortunate members of the social body. Few seem to have allowed themselves to wonder, whether the

affluence and advantage which formed the setting of certain social groups and the squalor and misery to which others were condemned, were in truth the manifestation of Divine and immutable will, as had long been asserted, or were the result of man-made conditions susceptible of change to be effected by human determination. The gracious spirit of tender pity may not be eliminated from a harshly competitive world, but humanitarianism based solely upon the motive of compassion renders beauty and dignity, satisfaction and gratification, permanent and uplifting influence to the role of benefactor, not to that of beneficiary, and its results are from their very nature, transient and superficial. Pity and mercy are but too prone to forget that it is "more blessed to give than to receive," and compassion, as Schopenhauer once pointed out, is only too often an expression of vanity and self-love.

To the philosophes we owe the first virile emphasis on the natural dignity, the inherent worth of man. To them is due the first vigorous protest at the inequalities of opportunity, at the chains which fettered men, which restrained them from the full development of their latent powers. From them came the first forcible denunciation of the religious teachings of submission and humility before an established order,—teachings which perpetuated immeasurably, the slavery of a large proportion of the social body. They voiced the demand for *justice for all men,* but it was as a voice crying in the wilderness. The cry for justice is sometimes the cry for revolution, the plea for the unwritten law. All the weapons by which the beginnings of justice might be secured, lay in the grasp of those to whom the doctrine of equality of opportunity did not appeal, since the "Divine will" had ordained that the strongholds of wealth and advantage should be theirs.

The humanitarian activities of the early nineteenth century, six illustrations of which are given in the following chapters, were based indisputably upon the principle of compassion, the desire to assuage misery. But within these movements are slight suggestions that the spirit inculcated by the philosophes and

ratified by the French Revolution is a spirit destined to be of permanent influence in the affairs of men. Evidence proves that humanity at large is beginning to understand the existence of fundamental rights common to all men, and to realize that ignoring and denial of these rights reacts to the injury of the entire social body, an injury not to be made good by the pity-based charity or complacent beneficence of a class.

This sense of pity for those whose lines are not fallen in pleasant places, however, this keen and understanding appreciation of the tremendous possibilities inherent in humanity, this desire for universal comfort and equal opportunity for all, an attitude frequently the result of personal relief from the pressure of poverty, all these elements common to the social idea, have themselves helped to create conditions which in turn intensify the strength of the ideas which created them.

The industrial revolution forged most of the weapons by means of which the demand for equal opportunity, for common elemental justice, bids fair, some day to be satisfied. It emphasized to the English working man, his importance as a social factor. He saw that society had need of him, that when he and his fellows "combined" they could affect working conditions, not only in the specific place in which he was engaged, but in the whole course of industry itself. From society's need of him he gains his first glimmer of understanding of what must be his rights in a social body to which he is requisite. From the experiences of his labor combination he acquires unconsciously elements which may serve as the foundation on which may ultimately rise that broader structure of integral society, born of a spiritual understanding of the social idea. The visible growth and wide diffusion of wealth taught him that the barriers of privilege and class were not decreed by omnipotence but created by human power and were to be scaled or overthrown by human energy. He saw plainly that wealth and its advantages was not necessarily restricted to any group or class, but was largely dependent upon the skill, energy, and initiative of the individual. And with the rise of personal ambition which always carries with it some

measure of self-respect, the common man begins to see that individual interests can not be divorced from community and social considerations.

The most obvious, most spectacular and most far-reaching result of the industrial revolution is found in the concentration of population in towns and cities. The simple fact of mere "living together," goes far toward explaining the tremendous growth in community sympathy, understanding and integration characteristic of the last century; has greatly hastened, if, indeed it may not be held largely responsible for, the development of this twentieth century concept,—the social idea.

With the growth of wealth came successive extensions of the franchise, steadily widening its borders, obliterating further and further the political distinctions of class. As in every nation where the power of the people has increased, in every known democracy, legislation for the protection and welfare of the people, legislation truly social, has come to be regarded, not as an activity in which government might engage, but as one of the purposes for which government existed, as one of the conditions under which the governed would consent to be governed. And social legislation is both cause and effect in the composition of the social idea.

Education of the people also, like social legislation, is both effect and cause. It began as a philanthropy, as the charitable provision of an avenue of enjoyment for the pleasure of those whom "Divine Providence" had cut off from other sources of gratification. It was based distinctly upon a motive of pity or mercy and represented the gratuitous beneficence of superior to inferior. But with the diffusion of wealth from developed industrialism and the consequent extension of the franchise which began in 1832, there was a dawning sense of uneasiness amongst the members of the upper classes, a spirit of anxiety for the welfare of the social body endangered by the ignorance of so large a proportion of its voting members. Men began to comprehend that education could no longer be safely limited to class, and that since its results affected the entire social body, the

government which represented that body should have emphatic voice in its control.

No one can estimate the full extent of the influence of popular education. It is a vital weapon in the fight for equal opportunity and common justice. Omitting the consideration of those tremendous gifts which it has brought to society through the development of capacities latent, and without popular education doomed to remain latent, in individuals, it has added an inestimable quota to the social idea. Through it the individual makes his first acquaintance with the spirit of team work, discovers bonds of unity outside his family relations, learns his first lessons in the rights of the majority, acquires his first sound concepts of community interest and understanding. And it must be remembered that popular education, as we of the twentieth century know it, was a direct result of conditions which developed from the industrial revolution.

In this last decade no contribution to the social idea has been so great and so far-reaching as that afforded by the sciences. They have shown the indissoluble links which unite the body and mind of the individual with the body and mind of his society. They have proved beyond controversy the integral nature of the social body, they have taught the individual that his destiny and that of his children's children is inextricably interwoven with that of the society of which they are members, they have made plain the danger to the individual when a proportion of the social body is afflicted with ills unnoticed or ignored. Through eugenics and pediatrics, science has emphasized the terrible and pressing need of conserving the unborn assets of the race by meeting more fully the needs of the existing generation. It tells the story of the demand and the means for social prevention and it points the way.

This twentieth century conception then, this social idea, is rooted deep in earliest civilization and has been formed of many elements and affected by many and varied reactions. In just what proportion these elements are combined, exactly what measure of reaction each influence has produced, no one can say. But

because this concept would build for the individual and for the race, because it recognizes and would satisfy the physical, psychological, and moral wants common to all mankind, because it would prevent rather than reform, because it is founded on the two most powerful incentives to human action, egoistic considerations *and* community sympathy, it holds fair promise to endure.

The author of this paper wishes to express to Professor E. R. A. Seligman her sincere appreciation of his gracious courtesy in extending the use of his private library of rare pamphlets. To Professor William W. Rockwell, of Union Theological Seminary, acknowledgment is made for keen criticism and suggestion, and to Professor James T. Shotwell, especially, obligation is recognized, not only for supervision and criticism, but for the sympathetic interest which has served as a stimulus in the preparation of this dissertation.

April 11, 1916.

II

CHILD CHIMNEY SWEEPS IN ENGLAND, 1788-1875

1. The Struggle for Prohibitive Legislation

Modern society accepts as a truism the theory of her right and duty to place child life within the protecting pale of the law. It is not long, however, as time is reckoned, since men were forced to struggle to compel their world to regard child life as a matter of more than parental concern, to see it as a social asset which must be guarded whether orphaned or under parental control by the laws of society itself.

The first[1] definite suggestion that the welfare of laboring children should be a matter of government concern seems to have been made about the year 1760, when "Ambulator" wrote to the *Public Advertiser*[2] declaring that magistrates should see to it that the children of their parish, apprenticed to chimney sweepers, were provided with suitable and comfortable clothing.

It was in the next decade, however, that the first effort was made to improve the condition of the little chimney sweeps whose miserable existence is one of the many blots on the story of adult treatment of childhood.

It was to Jonas Hanway,[3] the philanthropist, whose con-

---

[1]Mr. Keeling, in his *Child Labor in the United Kingdom,* p. 3, gives the following note—"In an anonymous 'Sketch of the Life and Opinions of Richard Oastler,' Leeds, 1838, it is stated that Richard Oastler's father, a cloth merchant of Leeds, was the father of the agitation on behalf of the ill-used and neglected climbing boys, 'in which he spent much time and money.' It has not been possible to trace any other references to Robert Oastler's activities in this direction."

[2]This "suggestion made to the *Public Advertiser,*" is quoted by Hanway in his *A Sentimental History of Chimney Sweeps in London,* p. xx.

[3]Hanway fought with all his ability to bring the public to some realiza-

tinued efforts in behalf of the parish children brought some slight measure of relief to those unhappy waifs, that the first moves were due. He sought,[4] with the assistance of David Porter, a humane master sweep, to form an association (which included master sweeps) "in behalf of chimney sweepers' young apprentices." This association attempted to obtain "humane and kindly" treatment,[5] by moral suasion, and was a complete failure.[6] Hanway[7] then began to agitate for Parliamentary action after the pattern of the "Spitalfields Weavers' Act" of 1773,[8] and he writes vivid and heart-stirring descriptions of the little bruised, deformed bodies, stuffed lungs, sore and weakened eyes, knees and elbows covered with open sores for six months until the tender skin became calloused to the rough usage, the unwashed, half-clothed condition, scanty fare irregularly supplied, and wretched lodging common to the fortune of the "climbing boys." [9]

---

tion of the terrible neglect to which the parish children were subjected. His *Letters on the Importance of the Rising Generation of the Laboring Part of our Fellow Subjects,* London, 1767, while restricted enough in its views from the standpoint of to-day, is far in advance of the general thought of his time. "In all civilized states, whether they are commercial countries or not," he says (p. 176, vol. i), "children are looked upon as riches. The truth is, they are our greatest wealth, for without them we should not be secure of any opulency, defence, or existence. And, therefore, to guard and defend them in their infant state and take cognizance of all that concerns them is so essential a duty that it is in effect guarding and defending ourselves."

[4]James Montgomery, *The Chimney Sweepers' Friend and Climbing Boys' Album,* p. 240.

[5]Letter (1773) sent to master chimney sweeps, quoted in the *Sentimental History,* p. 56.

[6]David Porter, *Considerations on the Present State of Chimney Sweeps,* p. 15.

[7]Dr. Buchan, a specialist of his day in Anatomy and Children's Diseases (*Dic. Nat. Biog.*), says, concerning Hanway (quoted in Montgomery, p. 72), "My late friend Jonas Hanway, used all his influence to ameliorate the condition of these unhappy creatures. But there are some customs which can only be thoroughly amended by being completely abolished. A law prohibiting the practice altogether would be at once laying the axe to the root of the tree and the evil admits of no other remedy."

[8]*13 George III,* c. 68.

[9]Hanway, *Sentimental History,* pp. 12-42.

It was known that children[10] were sometimes sold as apprentices either because of the extreme poverty or indifference of the parents, or because the natural guardians of their welfare were dead.

Two years after the death of Hanway, the bill he had struggled to secure was passed.[11] It provided that no master could take more than six apprentices, none to be hired out to other masters; "Sunday clothes" as well as a sweeping suit were to be supplied, and the cap was to bear on a brass plate the name and address of the employer. Penalties were provided to deal with masters who took boys under the age of eight, and complaints between masters and boys were to be adjudicated by the justices. The schedule of the act ends with the curious exhortation to masters and mistresses to "treat the said apprentices, with *as much* humanity and care as the nature of the employment of a chimney sweep shall admit of." [12]

The nature of the employment apparently "admitted" of

---

[10]Blake pictures the child sweep in the *Songs of Innocence,* "The Chimney Sweeper,"

> "When my mother died I was very young,
> And my father sold me while yet my tongue
> Could scarcely cry 'weep'! 'weep'! 'weep'! 'weep'!
> So your chimneys I sweep and in soot I sleep."

The poem was inserted in Montgomery's *Chimney Sweepers' Friend* (p. 343), under the following heading—"Communicated by Mr. Chas. Lamb from a very rare and curious little work," and the Oxford edition of Blake, 1905, says that the first publication of the poem was in Montgomery's book. Blake has another little poem on the sweep, in his *Songs of Experience,*

> A little black thing among the snow,
> Crying "weep"! "weep" in notes of woe.

Lamb himself wrote the little essay, *The Praise of Chimney Sweepers,* first published in the London Magazine for May, 1822, p. 405, and later in all the editions of Elia. The classic, however, is Charles Kingsley's *Water Babies,* published in 1863, after the publication of the first report of the Commissioners appointed by Parliament to investigate the employment of children.

[11]*28 George III,* c. 48.

[12]*Ibid.,* last paragraph of Schedule.

little "care and humanity," for many instances of deaths are recorded.[13]

That the public was beginning to stir under stories of child suffering, is evinced by the fact of the unopposed passage of Sir Robert Peel's bill of 1802[14] for the regulation of apprentices in the cotton mills.[15] *Laissez Faire* did not make as pleasant practice as it made theory, and agitation was going on in these same years[16] to extend the protection for parish apprentices to the climbing boys, especially as it was plainly evident that so far as "hiring out" and "suitable clothing" were concerned, the law of 1788 was a dead letter,[17] and a report,[18] made (about 1800) by Sir Thomas Bernard of the Society for Improving the Condition of the Poor, showed the utter squalor and misery of the lives of these pitiable children.

---

[13](a) *Annual Register,* 36, 30; 46, 406; 53, 7. (b) *Gentleman's Magazine,* June 25, 1804; August 7, 1804; May, 1811, etc. (c) Montgomery's *Chimney Sweepers' Friend,* pp. 25-48.

[14]*42 George III,* c. 73. *An Act for the preservation of the health and morals of parish apprentices and others employed in cotton and other mills.*

[15] "Peel rather naively gave as the reason for bringing in the bill, that he was convinced of the gross mismanagement in his own factories and, having no time to set them in order himself, got an Act of Parliament passed to do it for him." Cf. Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 16.

[16]The periodicals of the day discuss the matter frequently, *e. g.*:

The *Gentleman's Magazine,* October 4, 1802, "A Friend to Progress in Social Life": "Must a number of children be dwarfed and disfigured and, what is worse, made the victims of brutal cruelty, who, if reduced from such a situation, might contribute to the strength of our navy or to the culture of our fields, and thus repay by important services the benevolent invention (the machine) which raised them to a place of honor in our civil life?"

Ibid., December 10, 1802. *"P. Q."* feared legislative action, for he reminds the House that "care must be taken not to let Humanity get the better of Common Sense." (There seems to have been little danger.)

Ibid., February 12, 1803. "Antiphlogiston" is seriously perturbed over the possibility of a fire in London (should the climbing boys be abolished) "a calamity much more heart rending than the occasional acts of cruelty committed on a poor child who, whether he be apprenticed to a chimney sweeper, a cotton manufacturer, or a pin maker, is exposed to all the ill-treatment and neglect of those who think him once provided for."

[17]David Porter, *Considerations on the Present State of Chimney Sweeps,* pp. 19-20.

[18]Quoted by Frederic Keeling, *Child Labor in the United Kingdom,* p. 6.

In February of 1803 the "Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys by Encouraging a New Method of Sweeping Chimneys, and for Improving the Condition of Children and Others Employed by Chimney Sweeps," [19] was instituted under the patronage of a long list of notables of the day, headed by the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV.

The society offered premiums for the invention of a machine to clean chimneys[20] and, when such an invention had been made, agreed to provide machines gratis to those masters too poor to make their own purchases, but who had declared their willingness to use them if supplied.[21] A bill[22] furthered by the society was presented in the Commons the next year (1804). It sought more perfect regulation of the trade of sweep, the fact being well known that the entering age limit of *eight*[23] was seldom regarded by the masters.[24] This bill passed the Commons but was not returned from the Lords, and the horrors went on.

Another twelve years passed before Parliamentary action was contemplated, but the society had been working quietly and steadily to create public sentiment and to provide practical substitutes for the labor of the boys.[25] There are records of meetings[26] held for the promotion of the use of machines and of testimonials of their practicability,[27] and by the year 1816 there are evidences

---

[19] *Reports of the Committee of the Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys,* 1804, 1805, 1808, 1811, 1816, 1818.

[20] Statement of Wm. Tooke, Treasurer of the Society, before the Committee of the Commons. *Report from the Committee on the Employment of Boys in the Sweeping of Chimneys with the Minutes of Evidence,* 1817, vol. vi, p. 8.

[21] *Gentleman's Magazine,* November 4, 1803.

[22] *Hansard,* II, 478, 483, 958.

[23] *28 George III,* c. 48.

[24] *Hansard* II, c. 958. Also *Hansard* xxxvi, c. 1156. *Penny Magazine,* 1842, p. 322.

[25] *Reports of the Committee of the Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys,* 1804, 1805, 1808, 1811, 1816.

[26] *Gentleman's Magazine,* July 13, 1816. *Annual Register,* liv.

[27] *New Monthly Magazine,* January 1, 1816.

of strong feeling aroused against a "practice justly said to be disgraceful to tolerate in a Christian and civilized country." [28]

On June 5, 1817, a bill was offered in the Commons[29] which should prevent the further apprenticing to master sweeps of boys under fourteen, up to the first day of May, 1819, and after that date, no boys under twenty-one were to be allowed to follow this trade. The bill was presented by Mr. Henry Grey Bennet and seconded by Wm. Wilberforce. A committee was appointed to conduct an investigation and to report to the House, and the story of their findings is one beside which even the horrors of the factory child life paled.[30]

The evidence brought out the fact that it was quite customary for young children (six and seven, sometimes five years of age) to start to work at four o'clock in the winter mornings in order to get a chimney swept before fire was needed for the family breakfast, their nights having been passed upon bags of soot, or,

---

[28] *Gentleman's Magazine,* January 23, 1817.

[29] *Hansard* xxxvi, c. 889, 1155.

[30] *Report from the Committee on the Employment of Boys in the Sweeping of Chimneys, with the Minutes of Evidence,* 1817, vol. vi, p. 171.

The *Edinburgh Review* quoted some of the evidence at length (1819) with blistering scorn for those who opposed legislation in behalf of these climbing boys. *The Chimney Sweepers' Friend* (pp. 165-238) and the *Annual Register* (lix, 302) also contain quotations from the evidence secured by the Committee of the Commons.

In the article in the *Edinburgh Review* (1819, xxxiii, p. 320), Sydney Smith declared "we have been thus particular in stating the case of the chimney sweepers and in founding it upon fact, that we may make an answer to those profligate persons who are always ready to fling an air of ridicule upon the labors of humanity because they are desirous that what they have not virtue to do themselves should appear to be foolish and romantic when done by others." (This was undoubtedly intended to rebuke the *Gorgon,* a short lived, radical periodical which, in its issue of March, 1819, sneered at the Commons for its "ostentatious display of humanity, in its interest in factory children, climbing boys, and slaves.")

But, he adds, "after all we admit that it was quite right to throw out the bill prohibiting the sweeping of chimneys by boys, because Humanity is a modern invention and there are many chimneys in old houses that can not possibly be swept in any other manner. But the construction of chimneys should be attended to in some new building act and the treatment of boys be watched over with the most severe jealousy of the law."

at "best," straw pallets in the masters' cellars. They were often forced into angular flues (sometimes only seven inches square—"little boys for small flues" [31] inscribed on the cards left at the door by itinerant sweeps) with arms held above their heads the entire time of working, since otherwise it was impossible for them to get through at all; often they were burned severely when compelled to go into a chimney to extinguish fire caught in soot gathered there; they suffered from lung diseases produced from the constant breathing of soot, and from "chimney sweeps' cancer" caused by the constant irritation of tender portions of the body. Arms,[32] legs, and spines were often deformed from the unnatural positions into which the young, unformed bones had been forced in the daily work. A boy who had been a chimney sweep was, upon the termination of his indenture, useless in any other occupation, both because of the weakness of his body and because he was entirely without the slightest rudiments of training or education,[33] and was, therefore, thrown upon the parish. In London there were about two hundred master chimney sweeps with about one hundred and fifty journeymen and over five hundred boys, from all of whom not more than twenty could write their own names.[34] Death from suffocation by the soot, from smothering from smoke, from falls from rotten chimney pots, were commonplace occurrences among the wretched little apprentices.[35]

To the published report were affixed a petition filed by the master chimney sweeps of London against the bill[36] and the report (a favorable one) of the Surveyors and Builders that the adaptation and construction of chimneys for the admission of machines to clean them, were entirely practicable,[37] as proved by experiments made for the purpose of test.

---

[31] *Report of the Committee,* p. 20.
[32] *Ibid.,* pp. 10 et sq.
[33] *Ibid.,* Evidence of Wm. Tooke, p. 10.
[34] *Ibid.,* p. 11.
[35] Incidents of injury or death; *Ibid.,* 35-41.
[36] *Report of Committee of the Commons,* Appendix, p. 50.
[37] *Ibid.,* Appendix, p. 51.

The bill,[38] much debated in the Commons,[39] passed[40] safely despite arguments that "many chimneys could not be cleaned except by children," [41] and that, "anyway, these children were not the children of the poor, but the children of rich men improperly begotten," [42] and was sent to the Lords. The evidence before the committee of the Lords[43] was entirely similar to that before the committee of the Commons, but the bill was defeated in that House.[44]

Thoroughly disheartened, the Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys yet maintained its efforts towards

---

[38]Petitions in its support were filed in large numbers, *Hansard* xxxvii, 216, 560 and meetings were held in favor of its terms, *Gentleman's Magazine,* January and November, 1817, and January, 1818.

[39]*Hansard* xxxix, 448, 547.

[40]*Journals of the House,* vol. 74, p. 151.

[41]Sir J. Yorke, *Hansard* xxxix, 448.

[42]Mr. Ommaney, *Hansard* xxxix, 547.

[43]*Speech of the Right Honorable Stephen Lushington before the Committee of the House of Lords,* March 18, 1818, *Hansard* 37.

[44]Lord Lauderdale was reported to have highly amused the Lords by two stories (*Gentleman's Magazine,* April, 1819) as follows: The first, that when he asked his physician why he prescribed so much calomel in his (Lord L.'s) recent illness, he was told that calomel was like sweeping boys, "it finds its way into every crevice and cranny of the frame and sweeps away every deleterious particle, clean out; whereas other sorts of medicines are like the machines and, accordingly, do the business very badly. They do not follow all angles and turnings but pass over many important parts untouched, and leave heaps of matter which afterward kindle into mischief"; and second, one Irishman was boasting of the ease with which he cleaned a chimney by taking a goose and suspending it by a cord around its neck down the chimney where its flutterings and efforts to find a foothold cleaned the chimney most effectively. The second Irishman, disturbed at what he thought to be the cruelty to the goose, said: "But, Pat, a couple of ducks would do it just as well." And from these two stories he meant to show that zealots for the bill were so carried away in their eagerness to relieve a partial suffering that they completely forgot the general interests of society.

Also *Hansard* xl, 670. Lord Lauderdale, "If the legislature attempted to lay down a moral code for the people there was danger that every feeling of benevolence would be extirpated. It was like making a law to regulate the mode of a painter in his work. The painter might conform to the law but his taste would be destroyed."

the entire abolition of the brutal trade. In 1824 a member of the society wrote a circular letter which he sent to literary notables of the day requesting a "manuscript contribution" on any subject touching the life of a sweep, its hardships, sufferings, etc., these contributions to be published in a volume[45] and sold for the aid of the work of the society. The preface[46] of the book which soon appeared, expresses gratitude for communications from Sir Walter Scott,[47] Mrs. Joanna Baillie, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Samuel Rogers, Mr. Thomas Moore, Mr. Wm. Smythe (Professor of History at Cambridge), Mr. John Wilson (Professor of Moral Philosophy at Edinburgh), the Rev. Geo. Croly, and Mr. Chas. Lamb, expressing sympathy with the aims of the society, although they made no apparent literary contribution. Its chief interest lies in the evidence it affords of the widespread knowledge of existing evils which were yet permitted to continue.

At last, in June, 1834, definite action, such as it was, was finally taken. Just what gave the impetus necessary to secure the forward step seems difficult to determine. It is quite possible that the passage of the Factory Act of 1833[48] produced the necessary reaction. In any case, a bill to repeal the act of 1788[49] and to

---

[45]Montgomery, James, *The Chimney Sweepers' Friend and Climbing Boys' Album,* Illus. by Cruikshank, London, 1824. There are also included in the volume extracts from the *Minutes of Evidence given before the Committee of the House* (1817), *Short Account of the Society for Superseding the Necessity,* etc., and a statement of the conditions of the sweeping trade and attempts to regulate it prior to 1803, the date of the organization of the society.

[46]*Ibid.,* Preface, p. ix.

[47]Sir Walter Scott wrote, "In building my house at Abbotsford I have taken particular care by the construction of the vents that no such cruelty shall be practised within its precincts. . . . That (soot) which may adhere is removed by the use of a simple machine."

[48]*3 and 4 William IV,* c. 35. (Textile Mills). (a) Night work prohibited to all under eighteen between the hours of 8:30 P. M. and 5:30 A. M. (b) No child under eighteen to work more than twelve hours daily or sixty-nine hours weekly. (c) No child under eleven the first year, under twelve the second year, and under thirteen the third year after the passage of the act, was to be employed more than nine hours daily or forty-eight hours a week.

[49]*28 George III,* c. 48.

regulate more strictly the conditions surrounding apprentices in the trade of chimney sweeping, was presented in the House[50] and shortly became law.[51] This statute provided that no child under ten should be apprenticed to a chimney sweep, and that no children at all should be apprenticed to masters who were not householders. Indentures then in existence, however, of boys under ten, were to remain in force. Apprentices under fourteen were to be so designated upon brass plates on their caps. Every indenture had to be indorsed by two justices and the boys were to be given a trial at the trade before indenture, the justices to refuse to sign the binding paper if the boys were unwilling.[52] After the date of the passage of the bill, chimneys were to be built with regulations in regard to the size of the flues, the angles of the passages, etc., and penalties were to be inflicted for ignoring these regulations.

And this schedule[53] ends with the declaration that "masters shall in all things treat said apprentices with care and humanity!" So much gained in fifty years of the suffering of childhood plus efforts to prevent it on the one side vs. inertia and selfish opposition on the other.

There is little evidence in the periodicals of the day that the struggle to abolish the "climbing boys" was nearing its close. Indeed, public interest in the subject seems dead, swallowed up perhaps in the larger maelstrom of factory conditions and attempts for remedial legislation in that direction.

In April, 1840, however, a bill fathered by Fox Maule and Lord Ashley was presented in the Commons[54] and in June was

---

[50] *Hansard* 3rd Se. 24. 418.

[51] *4 and 5 Wm. IV*, c. 35.

[52] It had been brought out in the evidence taken before the Committee of the House (1817) that boys had often to be driven to their work by the "rod," or by the application of burning straw to the soles of their feet to force them to climb, so great was their fear and dislike of their work when first apprenticed and before their "knees and elbows became as callous as leather, which they did in the course of *six months*."

[53] *Cf. 28 George III*, c. 48.

[54] *Hansard* 3rd Se. 53, c. 1092.

brought before the House in Committee.[55] In presenting the bill, Lord Ashley assured the Commons that "the condition of the factory children was tenfold better than that of the chimney sweeps and that, as far as he was concerned, he had no knowledge that cruelties so barbarous (as those practiced on the climbing boys) could be perpetrated in a civilized country." [56]

This bill provided that the enactment of 1834[57] should remain in force until July 1, 1842, and that after that date no child under sixteen might be apprenticed to a chimney sweep, and any one "compelling or permitting" a child to climb a chimney should be punished. After that date justices might discharge any apprentice who should apply for discharge, and all indentures of children under sixteen should be void. Construction of chimneys to be built in the future was also regulated and these regulations were to be strictly enforced.

In June, 1840, the bill passed the Commons and went to the Lords,[58] where it was subjected to a short delay until the select committee nominated, could report as to whether or not the committee deemed it possible for practically all chimneys to be swept by machines. The report being in the affirmative, the bill was passed July 27,[59] signed by the Queen on August 4, 1840,[60] and became law.[61]

It had taken sixty-seven years[62] from the time when the need for drastic regulation was first observed until the time when the practice was prohibited of permitting young children to be maimed, deformed, and killed in labor that should have been performed by mechanical devices!

---

[55] *Ibid.*, 55, c. 108.

[56] *Hansard* 3rd Se. 53, c. 1093. Ashley cites the fact that at that very time he knew of the employment of two children, four and one half and six years of age respectively.

[57] *4 and 5 Wm. IV*, c. 35.

[58] *Hansard* 3rd Se. 55, c. 433.

[59] *Ibid.*, c. 981.

[60] *Ibid.*, 1224.

[61] *3 and 4 Victoria*, c. lxxxv.

[62] 1773-1840.

Even now the difficulties were not ended. The law, since sufficient means of enforcement were not afforded, did not prevent the evil. Petitions are cited in 1851[63] from the clergy, the landowners, bankers, merchants, and others "that measures may be taken to prevent the use of children as climbing boys in sweeping chimneys," and other petitions are filed from the master sweepers of Manchester and Salford,[64] and from the Guardians of the Leicester Union,[65] urging the Lords to amend the Act of 1840. A bill was prepared in the Lords (1854) but tabled in the Commons. But in 1864, following the report of the Commissioners[66] on Children's Employment, a bill prepared by Lord Ashley passed both Houses and became law.[67]

This "Act to Amend the Act for the Regulation of Chimney Sweeps" provided that no master sweep might employ any person under the age of ten for any purpose whatsoever except around his own household or place of business, and that no master sweep entering a house for the purpose of cleaning a chimney might permit any person under sixteen in his employ or under his control to enter the house "before, with, or after" him while he was in the house for the purpose of carrying on his trade. And if question rose as to the ages of those in his employ, the burden of proof lay on the master. Excellent in matter, the law had yet no easy method for enforcement.

In 1872 (October 9) Lord Ashley wrote in his diary,[68] "Yesterday, stirred after a long interval by my poor climbing boys, one suffocated in a flue in Staffordshire. The Act which forbids the practice, intentionally made the evidence difficult. Years of oppression and cruelty have rolled on and now a death has given me the power of one more appeal to the public through the *Times*." No one heeded this appeal, however, either through

[63] *Journal of the House of Lords,* vol. 83, p. 440, July, 1851.
[64] *Ibid.,* vol. 87, p. 386, July, 1855.
[65] *Ibid.,* vol. 88, p. 370, July, 1856.
[66] *Report of Commissioners on Children's Employment,* First Report, 1863, p. 295.
[67] *27 and 28 Victoria,* c. xxxvii.
[68] Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury,* vol. iii, p. 156.

the House or through the *Times*. Again, March 20, 1873,[69] "Then to the House of Lords to move for the report of the coroner's inquest on a poor little chimney sweeper seven and a half years of age, killed in a flue at Washington in county Durham. So much for my labour on behalf of the climbing boys! But, by God's mercy, good may come out of evil."

Then in 1875[70] came the story of a boy, George Brewster, suffocated in a flue where he had been sent by his master. It was in the Fulbourn Lunatic Asylum in Cambridge, and at last the thunder broke. In the issue of March 25, 1875, the *Times*, in a column and a half, said: "The master sweep was to-day found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to six months hard labor (the master of Brewster). The law mitigates the guilt of this monstrous crime by including it in the category of manslaughter. If there is still to remain any distinction between legal and moral guilt we are bound to make that distinction and to meet those demands by declaring that whoever deliberately permitted and authorized the employment of this unfortunate boy is guilty of murder. The Statute book proclaims these things (cruelties, etc.) as things of the past, but the present case reveals that the practice which involves them is still in vogue. We can hope for no substantial reform until the passing of a law which would have placed the responsible official of the asylum in the dock by the side of the man who has been found guilty of the murder of Geo. Brewster."

Ashley did not lose his opportunity. His diary,[71] under the date of April 28, 1875, says: "Have prepared a bill! God in his mercy, grace, and love be with me! Shall I have, after the manner of men, to contend with beasts? One hundred and two years have elapsed since the good Jonas Hanway brought the iniquity before the public, and yet in many parts of England and Ireland it still prevails with the full knowledge and consent of thousands of all classes."

---

[69]Hodder, vol. 3, p. 156, *Life of Shaftesbury*.

[70]London *Times*, March 25, 1875.

[71]Hodder, vol. 3, p. 158 of *Life of Shaftesbury*.

Success was at last at hand—the bill was passed without delay and its terms[72] demanded, as essential for conducting the trade, that each master sweep must secure his license from the chief of police of his district, the license to become void if the terms of the acts of '40 and of '64[73] were disregarded.

"The whole agitation," says Mr. Keeling, "is an extraordinary example of the futility of enacting labor laws without providing adequate means of enforcing them. . . . No doubt the problem of inspecting chimney sweepers presented special difficulties. But it was never really faced by Parliament until the licensing system of 1875 was established. In consequence we have the spectacle, at once tragic and ridiculous, of the Legislature spending ninety years in unsuccessful attempts to protect a few thousand boys from the daily risk of being suffocated, burnt, or crippled." [74]

2. The Antecedents of the Promoters of the Legislation in Behalf of the Child Chimney Sweeps

In outlining the history of the efforts to remove the little chimney sweepers of England from the bondage of their trade, an attempt has been made to determine something of the antecedents of those who promoted and who opposed remedial legislation. In the belief that nineteenth century action was very largely developed in line with religious conviction or philosophic bias, light upon those points has been sought especially.

Unfortunately, biographical material upon stars of lesser magnitude is very limited and for that reason there are certain active participants in the work, concerning whom it has been impossible to find data. Most of the statements submitted have been taken from the *Dictionary of National Biography,* the others from varied, cited biographical sources.

By an anonymous authority,[75] Robert Oastler, the father

[72] *38 and 39 Victoria,* c. 70, August 11, 1875.
[73] *3 and 4 Victoria,* c. 85; *27 and 28 Victoria,* c. 37.
[74] Keeling, *Child Labor in the United Kingdom,* p. 9.
[75] See note (1) at the beginning of this chapter.

of Richard, is named as "the father of the agitation on behalf of the ill-used and neglected climbing boys," but no supporting authority has been found. He was a Methodist, a close personal friend of John Wesley.

Jonas Hanway is the first promoter of the efforts in behalf of chimney sweeps, of whom we are certain. Of his religious views there seems no plain statement, but as he was a Governor of the Foundling Hospital of London and one of the founders of Magdalen Hospital, it is reasonable to suppose him an Anglican. He was not successful in his attempt to secure legislation but, two years after his death, his coworker, David Porter, a master chimney sweep, concerning whom no data seems available, introduced a bill which became law.[76] In his motion[77] for leave he speaks of Hanway and the influence of his views.

The motion[78] to bring in the next bill for remedial legislation was made by Major John Cartwright, the political reformer and anti-slavery sympathizer. Of him a notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine*[79] says: "He frequented no place of worship for many years, but his mind was deeply imbued with religious sentiments," all of which tells nothing.

In the years before protective legislation was again sought, the Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys was very active, two of its most important members being its secretary, Wm. Tooke, and James Montgomery, best known as a hymn writer. Mr. Tooke was the son of an Anglican chaplain, and was himself active in university and Church affairs. "During the five sessions he sat in Parliament he supported reform and gave his vote for measures for the promotion of education and for the abolition of slavery, but in later life his views became more conservative." [80]

James Montgomery was the son of members of the Moravian

[76] *28 George III*, c. 28.

[77] The *Parliamentary History* makes no mention of this bill but it is found in the *Journal of the House of Commons*, 43, p. 405.

[78] *Hansard*, 1, c. 853.

[79] *Gentleman's Magazine*, November, 1824.

[80] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

Church. His father was a minister and both parents were missionaries to the Barbados. No definite mention of his own adult affiliations was found, but there is no reason to believe, from his hymns, but that he remained a sympathizer with the church of his childhood.

Of the other members of this society little was found. Its prospectus and reports named many peers as patrons and naturally they were very largely Anglicans.

The bill of 1817 was introduced[81] by Henry Grey Bennet, who sat many years for Shrewsbury and allied himself with many measures for reform,[82] but of whom no biography has been found. His bill was seconded by William Wilberforce, the great Evangelical abolitionist, whose conversion when on a trip to the Continent had far-reaching effect upon his political and social sympathies. The efforts of these two were strongly supported by Pascoe Grenfell, who was probably an Anglican but, concerning that point, the data was obscure.

That bill, after triumphal passage of the Commons, was not returned from the Lords, where its defeat seems to have been largely due to Byron's "Scotch, shrill, and acute" [83] Lord Lauderdale, who goes on record for opposing any and everything which can possibly be of advantage to the working classes.[84] One of the journals said of him,[85] "in June, 1831, under the skilful manœuvering of that cunning old recreant, Lauderdale, twelve of the sixteen Scottish representative peers were anti-reformers." He was the great grandfather of Arthur James Balfour.

The opposition to all the bills was naturally stronger in the Lords than in the Commons, even when the bill originated there, or when it was favored by a majority of the Lords. Their

---

[81] *Hansard,* xxxvi, p. 1155.

[82] *Abuses of Newgate, Pamphleteer,* 1818.

[83] Byron, *Letters and Journals* (Prothero Ed., London, 1901), vol. 5, p. 412.

[84] See also, chapters on *Owen and New Lanark* and *Factory Legislation for Children,* for further examples of Lord Lauderdale's policies.

[85] Cockburn *Journal,* 1874, i, p. 17, quoted by *Dic. Nat. Biog.*

sensitiveness to class consciousness and their faith in property rights were, of course, more aggressively dominant.

In 1840 Fox Maule, supported by Sir Robert Inglis and Lord Ashley, moved for permission to introduce a bill.[86] The second Baron Panmure was "one of the few Scottish noblemen who supported the Free Church of Scotland at the time of the disruption which followed upon the insistence of the Church that it must be entirely free from interference in spiritual affairs" (1843). Sir Robert Inglis was a strong Churchman and ardent supporter of Ashley in chimney sweep and factory legislation.

From that date until 1875, when legal protection was at last entirely secured, Lord Ashley was the leader and may be held almost solely responsible for the success of the movement.

Of him, the *Dictionary of National Biography* says, "In religion Shaftesbury was a very cordial and earnest supporter of evangelical views. Ritualism and rationalism were alike abhorrent to him. While attached to the Church of England his sympathies were with Evangelicalism wherever he found it." His biographer gives more light; he quotes[87] Shaftesbury's stories of his nurse (apparently a Methodist) and her great influence over him, how his entire religious views were molded by her. In September, 1856, Lord Shaftsbury wrote a letter[88] to Mr. Haldane, who had addressed him as a leader of the Evangelical party, assuring him that such is not his position, and adding, "besides, although there are many points, indeed most points, in which I concur theologically with the Evangelical party, there are some in which, as friends and counselors, I think several of them are very far from charity or justice."

Mr. Hodder makes also the statement that in 1884 Lord Shaftesbury said to him and to others: "I am essentially and from deep-rooted conviction an Evangelical of Evangelicals. I have worked with them constantly and am satisfied that most of the great philanthropic movements of the century have sprung

---

[86] *Hansard,* 3rd s. 53, p. 1092.

[87] Hodder's *Life of Shaftesbury,* i, 36 et sq.

[88] *Ibid.,* iii, p. 3.

from them. I stand fast by the teachings held by that party, but I am not, and never have been, a leader of that party."

To summarize: Those who are on record in *Hansard* and elsewhere as peculiarly active in promoting legislation in behalf of chimney sweeps, number (if we include Robert Oastler) twelve men; of these, the religious affiliations of three—David Porter, John Cartwright, and Henry Grey Bennet—were not found. Two, Sir Robert Inglis and Wm. Tooke, were strong Churchmen. Two, Jonas Hanway and Pascoe Grenfell, were probably Anglicans. One, Fox Maule, was probably Presbyterian in his allegiance; while one, James Montgomery, was a Moravian. Robert Oastler was a Methodist, a close follower and personal friend of John Wesley.

Two, William Wilberforce and Lord Ashley, were strongly Evangelical in their sympathies.

Careful investigation, *as far as sources permitted,* of those who opposed the bills brought out the fact that no one on record in the opposition was apparently a member of the Evangelical Church or of a Dissenting body.

These facts are merely submitted: no attempt is made to draw any conclusion.

III

FACTORY LEGISLATION IN BEHALF OF CHILDREN, 1800-1853

1. The Struggle for Prohibitive Legislation

A. INTRODUCTION

In attempting to treat the history of the labor of children in factories and the process of securing legislative protection in their behalf, there are certain features of the times which must be held constantly in mind if any estimate is to be secured in scales other than those of twentieth century emotion.[1]

As Miss Hutchins and Miss Harrison point out,[2] the problem of pauperism had been for centuries of such vigorous and alarming proportions[3] that the mere fact of steady work avail-

[1]The processes of social reform are always slow, often seeming most unreasonably so. "I once asked my friend, the late Lord Shaftesbury," said Thorold Rogers in his *Economic Interpretation of History* (New York, 1888, p. 355 et sq.), "why he did not extend the sphere of his Acts to the agricultural children as well as to the young people in the factories, for that he must have known that the work of a child in the fields, ill fed, poorly clothed, and exposed to the worst weather in the worst time of the year, was to the full as physically injurious as premature labor in the heated atmosphere of a factory. He told me that he well knew the evil, but was powerless to meet it; that if, in the struggle he had engaged, he had enlisted the hostility of the manufacturers, the farmers, and landowners, he should be incapable of doing anything at all and that if he secured the liberation of one class of children, time would insure the emancipation of the rest. Lord Shaftesbury was a courageous and persevering man, and his answer showed how well he knew what are the difficulties of practical politics. People blame compromises when they do not know how rarely it is possible to get anything else. Nor do men ordinarily see that all guaranteed interests are of suspicious justice and that, just or not, they inevitably invite attack."

[2]Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation,* London, 1911, p. 4.

[3]See *Statutes—22 Henry VIII,* c. 12 (many in the reign of Elizabeth); *43 Elizabeth,* c. 2; *14 Car. II,* c. 12; *3 Wm. and Mary,* c. 11 (many in reign of Geo. III); *9 George III,* c. 37; *18 George III,* c. 47; *32 George III,* c. 57; *36 George III,* c. 23, etc.

able for the poor, even if only for their children, seized upon the unanalytic imagination as unqualified good.

Moreover, early nineteenth century morality in its distinctly left over Puritan expression, emphasized the righteousness of unceasing toil as the greatest available insulation against the wiles of Satan. [4]Any leisure for the lower classes was dangerous and pernicious, and inexorable labor the only possible moralizer.

Again, the influence of the Church—of religious, ethical and moral codes of centuries, had emphasized the dominance of filial duty. The conception of parental responsibility from the mere fact of creation,—[5]the comprehension that the physical fact of birth does not of necessity engender true motherhood—the recog-

---

Conditions were especially bad in the early nineteenth century. Lord Byron, in the House of Lords, declared (*Hansard* xxi, c. 970, February 27, 1812), "I have traversed the seat of war in the Peninsula, I have been in some of the most oppressed provinces in Turkey, but never under the most despotic of infidel governments did I behold such squalid wretchedness as I have seen since my return in the very heart of a Christian country."

Joseph Adshead, in *Evidence of the State of the Laboring Classes in 1840 and 1842*, London, 1842, p. 10, declared that at that time the population of Manchester was, according to the latest census, 163,667, and that the Relief Committee of the city had in less than a year had to afford relief to 41,128 persons, or more than one in every four.

Spencer Walpole declared (*History of England*, i, p. 212), that in 1815 about one in every eleven was a pauper and that while some 570,000 children were having some instruction 1,500,000 were entirely without.

[4]Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation*, p. 3, cite illuminating quotations from T. Woods, *Account of the Shrewsbury House of Industry*, 1795, and from Robert Potter's *Observations on the Poor Laws*, 1775. See also an *Enquiry into the Principle and Tendencies of the Bill now pending in Parliament*, London, 1818. There is an amusing inquisition in the *Parliamentary Report of the Committee in 1816*, with Robert Owen as witness (p. 23), "What employment could be found for the children of the poor (provided Owen's bill were carried) until they reach the age of ten years?" "It does not appear to me to be necessary for children to be employed in any regular work until they are ten years of age." "What would you do with them?" "Instruct them and give them exercise." "Would not there be a danger of their acquiring vicious habits by that time for want of regular occupation?" "Their habits are good in proportion to the extent of their instruction."

[5]The attitude of society through all the ages towards the "illegitimate" child is distinctly significant in this connection.

nition of social rights in children and the consequently just claim of society to exert protective control over the rising generation, are perceptions reached late in the evolution of social theory.

An inflexible principle of child labor for family support (provided it were not over long and severe) does not seem to have been offensive or even distasteful to eighteenth and early nineteenth century thought.

Child labor itself was an expression of the individualistic spirit which, rising with the growth of middle class wealth and power in the Elizabethan era, reached its extreme logical development in the doctrine of *laissez faire*.

When regulated by guild rules[6] or by guild enforcement of government statutes,—exploitation of children in the labor market was more or less preventable, but when those barriers were removed, nothing remained to impede the employment upon the largest possible scale of the cheapest labor available.

Not until the sixteenth century had the middle class tasted much of the joys of possession, and even then, wealth was not wide spread. Never before the introduction of machinery into textile industries had wealth accumulated in such quantities that the very small capitalist (who had been developing since 1700) could hope to enlarge his industry to the point of becoming a wealth producer. This enlargement however, and his consequent gains, depended upon his ability to meet competition and that often meant for the man of small means, machinery erected in a couple of cottages huddled together with their partition wall knocked out and the cheapest of labor worked the longest of hours. All the evidence produced in the investigations private and public, points out that the small factory owner was the worst offender against the children. But novelty of conditions, the charm of expanding industry, and the greed for increasing wealth, combined to prevent those actively engaged in or affiliated

---

[6]The Introduction of O. J. Dunlop's *English Apprenticeship and Child Labor*, New York 1912, gives a full sketch of the changing conditions and the book itself is a detailed account.

with the industry, from securing a vision of the *process* in its true perspective.

Early factory machinery was water driven and in consequence, the first factories were built on the water ways not in the thickly populated districts. Factory hands could not be secured therefore, from the population and were supplied from the ranks of the parish children of city parishes, the overseers of the poor being delighted to lessen the poor rates by giving over the support[7] of dependent children to the manufacturers. Incontestable proof of the entire indifference of the public to the welfare of children en masse, lies in the fact that not until 1802 was there the slightest limitation on the manufacturers who might treat child apprentices as the dictates of conscience or caprice decided. The bill of 1802 made no real advance in forcing humane conditions but it was the first move to establish the principle of legislative interference. From London and other cities, wagon loads of children were shipped to the factories of the North where they were fed, clothed, housed and worked as their masters chose. The many cruel pictures offered by Dickens in his "fiction" can be no worse than the official reports of government investigators.

Popular attention was not entirely oblivious of the evils which such conditions engendered. In the late eighteenth century, Dr. Percival of Manchester, advised legislation[8] for factory hours and conditions and Dr. Aikin described[9] the very ill effects of factory labor on children.

Apprentices in all ages had suffered from cruel masters, but they had (whether frequently used or not) the right of appeal to magistrates. The bond too, between master and apprentice, working side by side in the shop and moved by mutual interest,

---

[7]Owen tells (*Autobiography*, App. B. p. 277) that his father-in-law, Mr. Dale, had been compelled to take parish children at the age of six, seven and eight, for otherwise the Directors of Charity in Edinburgh and Glasgow from whom most of them came, would not supply the necessary laborers.

[8]The resolutions on the subject drawn up by Dr. Percival and his confreres of the Manchester Board of Health, were embodied in the *Report of Peel's Committee* (1816, Vol. III, p. 139.)

[9]John Aikin, *The Country Around Manchester,* (1795) pp. 219 et sqq.

was much closer and more personal than was possible between a master manufacturer and those who tended his machines. Before factory days, moreover, labor even when tiresome, was not so monotonous in its nature, not of such excessive hours, nor so systematized.

B. THE BILL OF 1802

The first Parliamentary move for child protection in factories was instituted by Sir Robert Peel the first, himself a master manufacturer. In a document afterwards submitted to the Committee of the House when "Peel's" bill of 1819 was pending,—he says, in speaking of this first legislative action,—"Having other pursuits, it was not often in my own power to visit the factories, but whenever I was able to do so, I was struck with the uniform appearance of bad health and frequent stunted growth of the children. The hours of labor were regulated by the interest of the overseer whose remuneration depending on the quantity of work done, he was often induced to make the poor children work excessive hours and finding my own factory under such management and learning that like practices prevailed in other parts of the Kingdom where similar machines were in use, I introduced the bill of 1802—not so much for the benefit of others but finding that my own mills were mismanaged and that with my other pursuits I had it not in my power to put them under proper regulation."[10]

This bill[11] ignored in the Parliamentary History and known as an "Act for the Preservation of Health and Morals of Apprentices and Others Employed in Cotton and other Factories and Cotton and other Mills," was passed[12] without any opposition—probably because of the influence of Peel's position as a manufacturer. It provided a twelve hour day with no night work,—instruction to be given to each apprentice for a part of each day

---

[10] *Report of the Committee on the Labor of Children in Factories,* 1816 III, 133.

[11] *42 George III, c. 73.*

[12] *Journal of the House of Commons,* Vol. 57, p. 534, June 2nd, 1802.

for four years of his apprenticeship,—the three r's to be his subjects. He was also to be supplied with proper clothing and to be given Sunday instruction. The apartments of the sexes were to be entirely separate. Proper ventilation and cleanliness of the factory were provided for and justices (if they chose) were to appoint visitors with requisite powers for investigation and inspection. The bill modified the conditions slightly perhaps, but was of little value except that it initiated a principle of the legal limitation of working hours by the state. Its sponsor seems to have been more satisfied with its workings than were others, for in his motion to introduce the bill of 1819 (the motion was in 1816) he declared in debate[13] that it "had been rewarded with the happiest of results."[14] Since however, it was for the preservation of the apprenticed parish child, and not for that of the "free" child laborer, it was a piece of Poor Law not of Factory Legislation.

C. THE BILL OF 1819

The invention of the steam engine, evolved the "free" five and six year old factory hand. With steam as motive power, factories could be erected wherever the masters chose and town population could supply the children employed. This was much more to the convenience of the manufacturers who were no longer put to the trouble of feeding, lodging and clothing their workers, who lived at home.

The evils were early apparent. By 1808 a clothier writes,[15] "the poverty of the family . . . obliges a poor workman to send the children to the factory at the age of six or seven—there to be exposed amidst most dangerous temptations. At this age many of these poor children are obliged at 5 A. M. to walk a mile or two to their work even in the depth of winter, through frost,

---

[13] *Hansard* xxxiii, c. 884.

[14] Cf. Evidence offered in the *Report of the Committee of the House*, 1816, III, p. 136.

[15] *Observations on the Woolen Manufacture by a Clothier*, Leeds, 1808, p. 22, et sq.

snow or rain, generally bare foot and often half naked and do not return before eight or nine at night. In many instances they are required to work alternately, one week by day and the next by night to the utter destruction of their health and morals: the health of these children suffers also not a little from the ill usage to which they are exposed at the factory and their wickedness is prodigious even to a proverb."

The move for the relief of these six year old "free" laborers came from a master manufacturer, Robert Owen.[16] His New Lanark mills, extremely successful from a financial standpoint, were managed with a spirit of humanity and steadfast belief in the potency of favorable environment on the character of those concerned, which made the village and its population a model of their day and kind. He himself admitted no children to work in his factory under the age of ten, and provided day time care and schooling for them, from the age of 18 months to ten years and evening schools for adults and older children.

In 1815 he called a meeting of the master manufacturers in Glasgow, where he spoke[17] of the conditions existing and appealed for a move to lessen the labor of the children, the horrors of which he knew only too well. Mills were being run 16 hours a day with a single shift, the greater number of the child employees being eight years of age and under. Fourteen hours daily was a common average.

When it was evident that the master manufacturers would make no move, Owen himself framed a bill which Sir Robert Peel agreed to present in the Commons. On its first motion before the House,[18] Peel told of the condition of the factories and that the working of six year old children 14, 15 or 16 hours a day meant neither "secular nor religious instruction and developed all the evils which such ignorance carried in its train." The bill was intended to affect all textile factories but the opposition aroused was so stormy that all but cotton mills were removed from its

[16]See chapter on Owen.

[17]*Observations on the Cotton Trade, Glasgow Chronicle,* Jan. 27, 1815.

[18]*Hansard* xxxiii, c. 884.

proposed jurisdiction at the very beginning and the matter was turned to a select committee[19] for investigation. The committee was appointed and proceeded with its work. The evidence showed[20] that many children six and older, worked thirteen to sixteen hours daily, except Saturday, when the labor lasted ten to twelve hours; that it was laborious, close, fatiguing work and that its physical effect was deplorable. Children were very frequently lamed and deformed, always over-fatigued and easily affected by illness. They had no future since there was no time for schooling or training and the majority of workers were wrecks at forty, dragging out the remainder of their days as subjects of the Poor Law.

In Owen's testimony which was sought in most disagreeable and acrimonious fashion on the part of some of the investigators,[21] he asserted that a ten hour day for all,[22] would result in no harm to any one but in "considerable improvement in the health of the operatives, in the instruction of the rising generation and in the diminution of the poor rates." He did not however make the best possible witness for the cause so dear to him, for some of his information was inaccurate, concerned water mills only or was not subject to proof. Nevertheless, the evil of the conditions which certainly existed could scarcely be exaggerated.

It was naturally expected that the bill would be introduced in 1817, the year following the committee investigation. That

---

[19]This annoyed Owen extremely,—he felt that Peel could have forced the bill through the House immediately if he had refused to consent to the committee, (*Autob.* p. 116) but as Owen himself acknowledged (*Ibid.*) how little he knew at that time of Parliamentary procedure, it is possible that he was entirely mistaken. However "Alfred" (i. p. 44) seems to feel that Peel was affected by the manufacturers and that his delay until 1819 was due to that influence.

[20]*Report of the Committee of the House on the Employment of Children in Manufactures,* 1816 iii, p. 235 et sqq.

[21]*Ibid.,* 1816, iii, p. 21 of the section (256). Owen's religious views were even this early a source of disapproval to many, although at this time he had not made his public attack (1817) on all religion.

[22]See also speech on *Observations on the Cotton Trade,* Glasgow, 1815.

year Sir Robert Peel did not appear in the Commons—secluded by illness, he said,[23] but in February 1818, he moved[24] to bring in a bill to regulate the labor of the children, telling of the physical results of existing conditions and declaring that those conditions demanded legislation. The whole tenor of the opposition in debate[25] was based on the following points, (1st) the children were "free" laborers and no one should interfere in the process of free contract between master and employee; (2nd) the trade was one which felt much foreign competition and it was extremely dangerous to interfere in an industry so important to the welfare of the country; (3rd) no Parliamentary law should interfere in the relations of parent and child, and (4th) reduction of hours would mean diminution of wages, destruction of trade, and great unemployment. There is not space for the arguments of debate,—some extract however is almost indispensable. Messrs. Phillips and Curwen were certain of the superior health of factory children over all others, while Mr. Finlay "had been visiting gaols containing many young children, and had thought then, that had they been properly at work in the factories learning the habit of industry, they would be benefitting their people, not breaking laws."[26] Poor babies, gaol or factory the only choice!

Many petitions from observers, from parents of the children and from adult operatives were filed in favor of the bill. 1818 and 1819 saw investigations by Lords' Committees whose reports tallied with that of the Committee of 1816. Ugly stories were told of sickly and deformed youths hurriedly dismissed from certain cotton mills—of children cleaned up and men sent to shave, of rooms scoured and windows opened to reduce the temperature all in preparation for an inspection of the factories by some medical men selected for the purpose by the proprietors.[27]

---

[23] *Hansard* xxxvii, c. 559.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Hansard* xxxvii, c. 581.
[27] *Evidence before the Lords' Committee,* 1819, p. 181-216.

The bill[28] was passed [29] in 1819—a sorry enough attempt but a beginning. As Owen had framed it, the entrance age was ten years,—as the bill was made law, the entrance age was nine. Owen's bill provided a ten and one-half hour working time between the hours of 5 A. M. and 9 P. M. for all under 18 years; the Parliamentary act (the bill "spoilt" Owen called it[30]) established a 12 hour working day for all under sixteen. In Owen's plan, each child was to have one-half hour's instruction daily for the first four years of his factory life, and Owen sought paid and qualified inspectors while the Act left the inspection to the justices or to appointed clergymen. Both bills provided for proper cleanliness in the factories.

Such then, was the nature of the first legislation in behalf of the "free" children employed in factories,—little enough but bitterly opposed.

D. THE BILL OF 1825.[31]

This bill[32] which became law the same year, was introduced[33] by Sir John Cam Hobhouse, seconded in the motion by Wm. and by J. Smith. It sought reduction of the working hours from twelve and one-half to eleven hours for all under sixteen, but its sponsor declared[34] that his great interest lay in having the bill of 1819 enforced,—an "excellent statute, shamefully evaded." Sir John Hobhouse believed this bill inoperative owing to the lack of a clause to compel the attendance of witnesses. The children in the "best" regulated mills were working twelve and one-half hours a day and for three or four days out of every week, were

---

[28] *Act 59 George III*, c. 66. *An Act for the Regulation of Cotton Mills and Factories.*

[29] *Journal of the House of Commons*—74, p. 590. June 29, 1819.

[30] Owen, *Autob.* Table of Contents of App. G.

[31] *6 George IV*, c. 63.

[32] "Alfred" says that the correspondence between Lancashire and Yorkshire manufacturers, favorable to restriction, was responsible for the introduction of this bill, *History of the Factory Movement*, London, 1857, Vol. I, p. 107.

[33] *Hansard*, New Series, 13, c. 643.

[34] *Ibid.*

not allowed to leave the mills for meals—as the machinery had to be cleaned and oiled at that time,—so they sat on the floor consuming their dust covered food in snatches while they worked. In other mills the hours were fifteen to sixteen daily.

The opposition believed in the regulation of the hours of children's labor where it was possible without affecting adult hours,—but that could not be, therefore—according to Mr. Phillips, the only thing to do was to repeal all that had been enacted and leave matters to be arranged between workmen and masters. Sir Francis Burdett was a sturdy supporter, arguing that nothing, more than child labor in the factories, demanded Parliamentary interference. The opposition deplored the extreme poverty and misery which would come upon the children if they were deprived of the wherewithal to purchase their present food, clothes and "comforts." The bill became law but little advance was made by it in the form in which it was passed.[35] The work day for children (9-16) was twelve hours with one and one-half hours more for meals and nine hours on Saturday between 5 A. M. and 4:30 P. M. The burden of proof of age, if that question arose, lay on the parents or guardians so that the manufacturer's skirts were cleared of responsibility. Later developments show that the bill was beneficial in its workings[36] but little advance of any real value was attained.

E. THE AMENDMENT OF 1831

In 1831[37] by a slight amendment, the burden of proof of age was laid upon the manufacturer[38] and the age of protection was raised from 16 to 18. Night work for all under 21 was abolished but it must be remembered that extra difficulty in enforcement was due to the fact that at least 50 per cent. of the

---

[35] *Journal of the House of Commons,* Vol. 80, p. 501 and p. 586.

[36] Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 15.

[37] *1 and 2 Wm. IV,* c. 39.

[38] *Hansard, N. S.* xxi, c. 1487. J. C. Hobhouse, sponsor of the bill, which was seconded by Lord Morpeth.

operatives under 18 were employed by the adult operatives.[39] This bill of 1831, trifling enough in its advance, may be largely attributed to the influence of a newspaper controversy which had been carried on in the columns of the Leeds *Mercury* and *Intelligencer*[40] since September of 1830, although it was introduced in 1829.[41]

Oastler, the "Factory King" as he was afterwards known, had had his attention called to the horrors of factory slavery by a personal friend, John Wood, a master manufacturer in Bradford, and from that time until victory was secured he never rested in the struggle.

Three names stand side by side in the contest for factory reform during these years. To these three, Richard Oastler, Michael Sadler and Lord Ashley, nothing of the factory system was of serious consequence but the fact that children were beaten and abused, lamed and crippled, rendered old by toil without years, and thrown on the dust heap of humanity that the factory produce might increase and England stand out in boasted supremacy in the textile industry.

Oastler, with fierce temper and pity-filled heart, protested until all were compelled to hear. With fiery words and unbridled passion, in a letter to the Leeds *Mercury* dated September 29, 1830, and headed by the words "Yorkshire Slavery," he set fire to the movement for the establishment of a ten-hour working day. Indifference was impossible; men were forced to range themselves as for or against legislation. Oastler was a Tory in politics as were also Sadler and Ashley, and later, especially after the passage of the Reform bill of 1832, the Tory party numbered many members among the promoters of the factory bills. Oastler never gave up the fight during the seventeen years before the Ten Hour Bill was an accomplished fact, spending

---

[39]Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation*, p. 37. Cf. *Reports of Factories Inspectors*, 1839, vol. xix, p. 4.

[40]Issues of October and November, 1830.

[41]Quoted in "Alfred," vol. i, p. 96.

his energies wherever they were called upon to further the effort and filling his "Fleet Papers," written during a three years' imprisonment for debt in the Fleet prison, with exhortations to continue the struggle.

He was not always wise, and in the cause for which he strove he sometimes embarrassed his coworkers by the violence of his partisanship,[42] but neither opposition nor personal cares moved him from his purpose. From his first letter, somewhat overcolored, but necessary to catch the public ear, his pen waged a mighty warfare in the columns of the "great, white liar of the North," as Cobbett called Baines, the editor of the Leeds *Mercury,* or in pamphlet productions whose style commanded attention, whatever the sympathies of the reader. His radicalism is the more interesting in that the streaks of conservatism were numerous in his nature; he was not democratic in feeling[43] however he struggled for a cause, strictly a cause of the people.

---

[42]In 1836, enraged at the breaking of the factory laws on the part of the masters, Oastler wrote a pamphlet called *The Law or the Needle,* in which he inserted the following preface: "To my Friends—When any of my enemies assail you with that foolish cry of 'Now, surely, you will turn your back on Oastler when he is going to teach the factory children to destroy their masters' property,' just laugh at them as they deserve and tell them to read this book and thus convince themselves that Oastler wishes the Millowners to retain their property by obeying the Law, or by the Magistrates enforcing the Law and punishing the lawbreakers; and that, if neither the Masters nor the Magistrates will respect the law, then, that in that case Oastler is determined to tease 'Old Ned' (provincial name for the steam engine) by teaching a little factory girl to tickle his fingers and his toes with an old knitting needle." In this pamphlet (p. 36) he publishes the fact that "G. S. Bull differs from him on this subject, that Hindley will never appear on any hustings with him again, and that Lord Ashley wrote to Mr. Bull, the Bradford rector who, as a member of the Short Time Committee, had secured Ashley to take up Sadler's bill, 'I am exceedingly grieved at the language of certain speeches which appear from time to time as coming from a person with whom we have cooperated in this important cause.'"

[43]The phrase, *The Throne, the Altar, and the Cottage,* used as the heading of Oastler's periodical, *The Home,* signifies his distance from a fundamental concept of popular right. He had the humanitarian but not the social point of view. In his *Letters to Wellington,* London, 1835, p. 84, he says, in speaking of the fact that Lord Morpeth had slurred the nobility of his blood in order

By the Fall of 1831 the operatives, influenced by the failure of the bill of that year, fathered by Hobhouse, to bring about any real changes (its only value was in the prohibition of night-work), and, despite the fact that they held no franchise, had banded together to throw the weight of their strong influence against the election of any one in their districts who was not in favor of a Ten Hour Bill.[44]

F. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE TEN HOUR BILL

Michael Sadler, who had worked vigorously for the Hobhouse bill, was chosen the Parliamentary leader for this legislation when he was returned for Newark in the election of 1831. Hobhouse felt that all that could be done at that time had already been accomplished and that Sadler's determination to introduce a Ten Hour bill would only give an air of absurdity and exaggerated extravagance to this type of legislation.[45] Nevertheless Sadler persisted and introduced[46] his bill, which was followed by an outpouring of petitions for and against its restrictions.[47]

Sadler's speech on the second reading of the bill[48] was a remarkably able effort, showing perfect familiarity with his field from every angle and intellectual as well as emotional reactions in his judgments. He held up to scorn the doctrine of the "free" laborer, adult as well as child, demonstrating clearly that inequalities in the demand and the supply of labor placed the employer and employed upon unequal bases from the very be-

---

to please the mob and secure their voting allegiance, "he knows as well as I how such observations feed the vanity of the plebeian rich—nor is he unaware how such *facts* destroy in the mind of the working classes, that good, right-principled Old-English feeling of honor and veneration for noble blood which was once inherent in Britons."

[44]Hutchins and Harrison, p. 48.

[45]Letter from Hobhouse to Oastler, November 16, 1831, quoted by Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* Manchester, 1866, p. 29-31.

[46]*Hansard* 3rd Series, ix, c. 255.

[47]*Hansard* 3rd S. x, c. 20, 106, 190, 529, 894, 1222, etc.

[48]*Hansard* 3rd S. xi, c. 340 et sq.

ginning. He described vividly the horrors[49] endured by the factory children and appealed for a Ten Hour day for those from nine to eighteen, with eight hours on Saturday, as a step towards remedial action.

The opposition was too strong, however, and the matter was referred to a select committee, the usual tactics of delay, for further enquiry and investigation. Sadler was chairman and spent every ounce of energy he possessed in the process of securing the data which should prove the case and secure the necessary legislation. The report of the Committee disclosed conditions which appalled even those most familiar with the situation.[50] The following extracts are typical of certain phases and dispose of the argument that there should be no legislative interference between parent and child, since no parent would permit his child to labor under conditions he knew to be detrimental to the child's health. William Osburn, an overseer in Leeds and a trustee of the workhouse, was asked,[51] "Suppose that the parents applying for relief for their children refused to allow them to labor in mills and factories, in consequence of their believing and knowing that such labor would be prejudicial to their health, and probably destructive of their lives; would they in the meantime have had any relief from the workhouse board or from you, as overseer, merely on the ground that children could not bear that labor?" "Certainly, not." "Would it be accepted as an excuse for not working that they could not conform to those long hours of labor?" "Certainly not." "So that the children of the poor and their parents have no alternative in such cases, but of submitting their children to this extravagant length of labor, or exposing them to absolute want and starvation as a consequence of refusing to be so employed?" "None whatever." Again, Samuel Coulson, an occasional operator, was

[49] See also, John Robertson, *General Remarks on the Health of English Manufactures,* London, 1831, for further description, "the working class is in worse condition than at any time within the past two centuries," etc. (p. 15).

[50] *Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to Regulate the Labor of Children in the Mills and Factories, with the Minutes of Evidence,* 1831-1832, xv.

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 463.

asked,[52] "If you had refused to allow your children to be so worked, you could not get any relief from the parish?" "None whatever." "So that you had no alternative but that excessive slavery or starvation?" "Yes, we must either submit to their laws or starve to death, for at no other place could we get them employed." "Are you not able to support your children without sending them to a mill?" "No, I have not had 2s. a week of labor for many weeks together."

Just before Parliament was dissolved the bill was to have been reintroduced, but the attendance of the House was so poor that Sadler withdrew it.[53]

The Reform Bill of 1832 disfranchised the borough for which Mr. Sadler had sat, and Huddersfield and Leeds both refused to return him. This was a serious blow to the cause for which he had labored, but the new election added strong supporters in John Fielden and William Cobbett, who were returned by Oldham, and Nathaniel Gould, who had worked for restrictions with Peel. In the same year further evidence submitted from Manchester[54] stimulated the demand for reform. When 1833 dawned there was some uncertainty as to who could be chosen to take Sadler's place as leader, and Mr. G. S. Bull, a rector of Bradford and a member of the Short Time Committee who had been especially active as an untiring advocate for the children, was sent to London to determine, after consultation, what move had better be made. From there he wrote to the secretaries of the Short Time Committees and others interested, that he had, with Mr. Sadler's consent, secured the promise of Lord Ashley to renew Mr. Sadler's bill in Parliament.[55] Of

[52] *Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to Regulate the Labor of Children in the Mills and Factories, with the Minutes of Evidence,* 1831-1832, p. 463.

[53] *Hansard,* 3rd S., xiv c, 966.

[54] James P. Kay, *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester,* London, 1832, "the evils affecting the working classes—so far from being the necessary results of the commercial system—furnish evidence of a disease which impairs its energies if it does not threaten its vitality," p. 76.

[55] Quoted in Grant, *History,* etc., p. 35.

this Lord Ashley wrote in his diary, "G. S. Bull and Sir Andrew Agnew proposed to me to take up Sadler's bill. I can perfectly recollect my astonishment, doubt, and terror. In vain I demanded time for consideration, only succeeding in securing a respite until the next morning." To Oastler, he wrote,[56] "Much, very much is owing to your humanity and zeal, and I will hope that your name will for years to come be blessed by those children who have suffered or who would have suffered the tortures of a factory. It is very cruel upon Mr. Sadler that he is debarred from the joy of putting the crown upon his beloved measure; however, his must be the honor, though another complete it. . . . I come to terminate in the 12th hour (if I succeed) his labor of the eleven."

Ashley's identification as leader of the movement was followed by immense activity on the part of promoters and opposers of a Ten Hour Bill. Even the *laissez faire* economist, John Ramsay McCullough, wrote[57] to Ashley, "If your bill has any defect in it, it is not by too great limitation, but by too great extension of the hours of labor." Kirkman Finlay, who was often spokesman[58] for the opposition to factory legislation, wrote to him declaring that the Ten Hour Bill was in reality one of the impracticable, visionary schemes of Robert Owen, and Finlay supports his belief in the wonderful advantages of factory labor by the statement that a child can learn to read and write in factory schools before he is nine years of age, and that there "are many instances in Scotland of clergymen and medical men who were once factory children and commenced their education at the factory school." "To give this measure a true name," he said, "it should be called 'A Bill to Transfer the Cotton Manufacture of Great Britain and Ireland to Foreign Countries.' " [59] Among those favoring the restrictions was The Metropolitan

---

[56]Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury,* vol. i, p. 153.

[57]Quoted in Hodder's *Life of Shaftesbury,* i, p. 158.

[58]*Hansard* 37, February 1818. He opposed bill of 1819.

[59]Kirkman Finlay, *Letter to Lord Ashley on the Cotton Factory System and the Ten Hours Bill,* Glasgow, 1833, p. 3 et sq.

Society for the Improvement of the Condition of Factory Children, which was very active[60] under its president, Wm. Allen, the Quaker.[61]

Much was written and published for and against the measure. One pamphlet[62] is quite naive in its arguments, "the very objection of the circumstance of scrofulous and sickly children being found in factories, if rightly considered, should operate in their favor. It is a well-known fact and can be proved in a multitude of cases that such children are admitted into the factories because they are unfit for other employments; there they find an asylum in a dry, warm atmosphere which suits their constitutions, and their general health is improved."

Periodicals of the day had significant reactions to the proposed bill. The *Westminster Review*[63] opposed it, voicing the belief that the woes of the working class were due to the corn law and other exorbitant taxes. With a fling at the educational clauses of factory bills, it said, "Abortive philanthropy cultivates the minds of the working classes just so far as rendering them capable of receiving right instruction and then abandons them to the tender mercies of blind chance or to the mischievous teachings of restless or perverted spirits." [64]

Robert Southey, who was a great friend of Ashley, took active interest in the legislation. January 13, 1833, he wrote,[65] "They who grow cotton are merciful taskmasters in comparison with those who manufacture it. Robert Hilyard told me the other day that Marshall, the member from Leeds, showed him through one of his factories and, upon Hilyard's remarking the extreme delicacy of the children, replied that they were consumptive, that a great proportion of them never reached the age of twenty, and that this was owing to the flue with which

[60] "Alfred," i, p. 320.

[61] Allen had been one of Owen's partners at New Lanark and was very active in varied philanthropic enterprises.

[62] Anonymous, *Exposition of the Factory Question,* Manchester, 1832, p. 5.

[63] April, 1833.

[64] April, 1833.

[65] Quoted by Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury,* i, p. 146.

the air was always filled. He spoke of this with as little compunction as a General would calculate the probable loss of life in a campaign; but a General may do this under a sense of duty; but I know not where the love of gain appears in more undisguised deformity than in a cotton mill." And on February 7th he wrote,[66] "There is one thing connected with these accursed factories which I have long intended to expose, and that is the way in which Sunday schools have been subservient to the merciless love of gain. The manufacturers know that a cry would be raised against them if their little white slaves received no instruction, and so they have converted Sunday into a school day. The Sunday school of the factories is an abomination, it is an additional cruelty, a compromise between covetousness and hypocrisy. Thousands of thousands will bless you for taking up the cause of these poor children. I do not believe anything more inhuman than the system has ever disgraced human nature in any age or country. Was I not right in saying that Moloch is a more merciful friend than Mammon?"

Fraser's Magazine registered great approval:[67] "We hope that the cry for relief will never cease until full and complete relief is afforded." Blackwood's waged a vigorous fight in behalf of the bill. "And, would you believe it, many of those who believe in the existence of the evils he (Sadler) has brought to light, oppose him on principle." "The lower orders—for godsake quarrel not with the word lower—are as low as tyranny can tread them down, are in many places as much parts of the machinery as the spindles themselves." In conclusion the assertion is made that, from computations drawn from the statistics of the Committee of 1832 and from other sources, "in the districts where the factory system exclusively prevails, as many have died before their twentieth year as have died before their fortieth year elsewhere." [68]

---

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[67] *Fraser's Magazine,* April, 1833, p. 377.
[68] *Blackwood's Magazine,* April, 1833, "The Factory System."

The findings[69] of Sadler's Committee[70] did not satisfy the manufacturers and through their Association[71] they secured a motion, made by Wilson Patten[72] supported by Lord Morpeth, for the appointment of a Royal Commission of Enquiry. The motion was carried by a majority of one[73] and was a source of much dispute both in the House and in public.[74] Lord Althorp, then Prime Minister, had been opposed to the bill from the start and was strongly in favor of the Commission. Lord Ashley accused him[75] of bad faith in not presenting to the House the names of the Commissioners, as he had agreed to do, for the approval of those interested in the bill, and in instructing the Commissioners that the hearings were to be secret.

The Commissioners met no cordiality in their investigation of the conditions throughout the country. The operatives of Manchester, Lancashire and other factory centers resenting the appointment of the commission arranged[76] parades of children, addresses and various demonstrations calculated by the Short Time Committees who had formed the plans, to force the Com-

---

[69]The petitioners of Leeds (16,000) bore testimony to the accuracy of the evidence given the Select Committee on the excessive hours of labor of the children and the consequent effects on health and morals. *Hansard,* 3rd S. xvi, c. 878.

[70]Sadler asserted that those witnesses who had spoken most favorably of the manufacturers had been discharged by them and were reduced to a state of pauperism because they had obeyed the summons of the House. *Hansard* 3rd S. xiv, c. 450.

[71]Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 40.

[72]*Hansard* 3rd S. xvii, c. 79. Patten declared that the evidence of Sadler's Committee was valueless,—that an influential member had said "you had better let me make out my case before other evidence is gone into"—and notwithstanding objections on the part of other members at such partial methods, their proceedings were thus conducted.

[73]*Hansard* 3rd S. xvii, c. 112.

[74]A bitter article appeared in *Fraser's Magazine,* June, 1833—and afterwards in pamphlet form entitled, *The Commission for Perpetuating Factory Infanticide.* The editors had no faith in the honesty of purpose of the Commissioners or of their findings. *Blackwood's* voiced the same feeling.

[75]*Hansard* 3rd S. xviii, c. 305.

[76]Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 41-49.

missioners to see and hear certain things whether or not they had planned to be blind and deaf to those conditions.

In July, 1833, the report[77] of the Commissioners was ready and to the astonishment of most, they advocated further legislative restriction. They declared[78] that "in some rare instances children begin work in the factories at five years; it is not uncommon to find them there at six; many are under seven, still more under eight, but the greater number are nine, while some, but very few, branches of manufacture do not admit of the employment of children under ten." Their conclusions[79] are as follows,—(1) we find that the children are employed as long as adults, (2) that the effects of the labor are (a) permanent deterioration of the physical constitution, (b) production of disease often irremediable, (c) partial or entire exclusion (by reason of excessive fatigue) from the means of obtaining adequate education and acquiring useful habits, or of profiting of those means when afforded, (3) that at the age when the children suffer these injuries they are not free agents but are let out on hire, the wages they earn being received and appropriated by their parents or guardians. We are therefore of the opinion that a case is made out for the interference of the legislature in behalf of children employed in factories."

Legislation was now certain but the question of the form which the legislation should take was at once raised. The government headed by Lord Althorp was strongly opposed[80] to Ashley's bill,—declaring that it went too far in some directions and not far enough in others.[81] Lord Althorp himself brought in a bill

---

[77] *Report of Commissioners on Employment of Children in Factories,* 1833, xx-xxi. 26-28.

[78] *Ibid.,* xx, p. 15.

[79] *Ibid.,* p. 31 et sq.

[80] *Hansard* 3rd S. xix, c. 219.

[81] Leonard Horner, *Factories Act Explained,* Glasgow 1834, p. 20. "Ashley's bill was not adopted because there was no proof that 12 (?) hours labor was more than adults could endure and would materially lessen wages,—and for the children, ten hours was too much."

founded on the report of the Commissioners and that bill[82] was passed[83] over Lord Ashley's measure. The debate in the House was forceful. Cobbett although he usually permitted Fielden to speak for Oldham, on factory legislation, remarked[84] that "a new discovery had been made. It had been formerly said that the Navy was the great support of England, then that the maritime commerce was the great bulwark of the nation; then, the colonies; then it was whispered that the Bank was; now it was admitted that the great stay and bulwark was to be found in 300,000 little girls or rather in one-eighth that number, for if these little girls worked two hours less per day, our manufacturing superiority would depart from us."

The Factory Act of 1833 provided, (1st) no child under nine to be employed, except in silk mills (Lord Ashley's bill had included all mills); (2nd) working hours of children under 13, to be 48 a week, or 9 hours in any one day; (3rd) between 13-18 the hours to be 69 per week or a maximum of 12 on any one day, (4th) total prohibition of night work; (5th) manufacturers punishable in cases of employment of children without an age certificate from the factory surgeon and a school certificate of attendance from the teacher; (6th) compulsory school attendance two hours daily for all under 13; (7th) employer to pay one penny of child's weekly earnings to the teacher; (8th) surgeons and inspectors to be free to visit factories at any and all times, to take testimony of the operatives on oath and to enforce the law by prosecution before a justice of the peace.

It is the provision of paid and qualified inspectors which marks the greatest advance in this bill. Heretofore no evidence was available except that which could be procured from the operatives themselves, since the factories were not freely open to strangers, and the workers naturally dreaded to risk the almost certain dismissal to which their assertions subjected them. This institution of paid and qualified inspectors marked a distinct turn-

---

[82] *3 & 4 Wm.* IV., c. 103.

[83] *Journal of the House of Commons*, Vol. 88, p. 687. Aug. 16, 1833.

[84] *Hansard* 3rd S. xix, c. 912.

ing point in all factory legislation.[85] Of the passage of this act, Oastler wrote to Wellington,[86] "Althorp is the tool and dupe of a bit of Parliament of Master Spinners who assembled in palace yard, brought in and carried the Masters' Bill—the present Factory Act."

Much discussion was roused. The promoters of the Ten Hour Bill ridiculed the value of such an inspection system as that provided,[87] evidently believing that the available positions as inspectors would be given to those who would neither see nor hear. By the end of 1835, these leaders who had quietly watched the workings of the Act, agreed that it was the most unsatisfactory measure which had yet been passed, since supposedly shortening the labor of children to eight hours, the very arrangement made it possible to use two shifts of children some of whom were undoubtedly apprentice children from the agricultural districts.[88]

It was extremely difficult[89] for even those most sincere in their desires, to carry out the law. Not until 1837 was birth registration compulsory in England and thus the only certain check on age certificates was not available. Surgeons' certificates were almost as unsatisfactory. In 1840, Inspector Horner declared[90] before the committee of the House, that veterinaries, dentists and every type of quack was used as certifying surgeon. Certificates secured by healthy, well-grown children were "loaned" or sold to sickly children, youngsters sometimes driving quite a trade in certificates secured from a half-dozen different surgeons. The inspectors finally came to the conclusion[91] that it would be best if two distinct sets of children were employed in

[85] Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation*, pp. 36-42.

[86] Oastler's *Letters to Wellington*, p. 122.

[87] See quotations from the *Leeds Intelligencer*, quoted by Hutchins and Harrison, p. 56.

[88] Grant, *History of Factory Legislation*, p. 56.

[89] *Manchester and Salford Advertiser*, quoted by Hutchins and Harrison, p. 57.

[90] Inspector Horner, *Report of the Select Committee to Inquire into the Operation of the Act.* 1840, x, p. 144.

[91] *Report of the Select Committee to Inquire into the Operation of the Act*, 1840, x, p. 48-49.

separate half days, and this suggestion of a "half-time" employment was incorporated in the Act of 1844. It was not easy to detect the overworking of children and there were innumerable instances of which the inspectors were well aware, but which they could not prove.[92] Repeated failures to enforce the law led many heretofore hesitant, to conclude that a uniform day was the only certain means of security.

In March, 1835, Poulett Thomson[93] introduced a bill to repeal the 13 year clause which in the following March would bring about 35,000 children from the factory after an 8 hour day (after March 1st, 1836, no children between the ages of 12-13 were to be employed more than eight hours daily.) The opposition was too vigorous and the Commons majority of two, was so small that he was forced to withdraw[94] the bill.

The operation of the Act of 1833 was of great benefit[95] to the children (9-13) but it bore hard upon the "young persons" (13-18) who were over taxed. There was much confusion in factories and mills, both operatives[96] and mill owners[97] feeling the pressure. Many masters gave up any attempt to employ children[98] and this worked some little benefit since their places had to be filled with adults or "young persons."

---

[92] *Report of the Select Committee to Inquire into the Operation of the Act,* 1840, x, p. 15.

[93] *Hansard* 3rd S. xxvi, c. 526. (He had taken active part in the support of the bill the clause of which he was seeking to repeal).

[94] Charles Wing, *Evils of the Factory System,* London, 1837, p. 1, "typical inconsistency of the Ministry in combating Ashley's bill and then seeking to repeal their own measure."

[95] "Alfred," *History of the Factory Movement,* ii, p. 83.

[96] Letters from James Turner to Francis Place and the Replies, published in a pamphlet edited by J. H. Roebuck, 1835 (*Factory Workers and Hand Loom Weavers and the Ten Hour Bill.)* See also, *Hansard* 3rd S. xxxviii, c. 894.

[97] Inspectors complained of the attitude of magistrates towards prosecution, (*Alfred,* ii, p. 84). In 1835 there were 177 convictions, often of the same offenders who preferred to pay the small fines imposed to keeping the law.

[98] von Plener, *English Factory Legislation,* p. 22. In 1835 (before the Factory Act was in full force) there were 3,164 factories with 56,455 children. In 1838 there were 4,217 factories and 29,283 children employed.

Never did the partisans of the Ten Hour Bill work harder. Joseph Rayner Stephens[99] in countless speeches throughout the country and John Fielden, himself a master manufacturer, both in print[100] and on the floor of the Commons, fought valiantly. On June 23rd, 1836,[101] Charles Hindley brought in a bill for "further regulation" of the factory labor but at the request[102] of Lord John Russell who pledged the government to strict enforcement of the Act, he withdrew his motion.

The pledge given was not redeemed, and Lord Ashley did not hesitate to charge the government[103] with broken faith. These years between 1838-1841 were filled with Anti-Corn Law and Chartist agitation and inevitably the problem of factory regulation was colored[104] by these simultaneous activities. "The Tories were taunted with the condition of the laborers in the fields and they retorted by tales of the conditions of operatives in the factories. The manufacturers rejoined by asking if they were so anxious to benefit the workman why did they not, by repealing the corn law, cheapen his bread? The landlords and the mill owners each reproached the other with exercising the virtues of humanity

---

[99]Joseph Rayner Stephens, (*The Political Christian Pulpit*) London, 1835.

[100]John Fielden, *The Curse of the Factory System,* Halifax, 1836. He believed in an eight hour day for all (p. 7). "Ministers and others are so self sufficient that they thought they could legislate for child protection without interfering with the adults. . . . It is this absurd system of attempting to separate the adult from the child in its labors that has rendered every Act that has ever been passed to give protection to children, almost void," (p. 23). "Give us a Ten Hour Bill as proposed by Lord Ashley or carry your own Act into full effect. Protect the children in some way or other. Do it wisely if you can but do it," (p. 31). "We have (in his own mills), reduced the labor of children under 13 years of age to 48 hours a week at no little inconvenience to ourselves but even more to the older hands, inasmuch as the relief given to the children comes to a certain extent upon the adults. But the overworking does not apply to children only—the adults are also overworked. The increased speed given to machinery in the last thirty years has, in very many instances, doubled the labor of both." (p. 43).

[101]*Hansard* 3rd. S. xxxiv, c. 839.

[102]Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 65.

[103]*Hansard,* 3rd. S. xliii, c. 968.

[104]Carpenter, *The Employment of Children in Factories,* p. 37 et sq.

at other people's expense." [105] In 1839 Fox Maule, Secretary of the Treasury under Lord John Russell, the Whig leader, moved[106] to bring in a bill to prevent the children working in more than one factory in the same day, and to give the inspectors greater power for enforcement. It excluded silk mills from its regulations and when Lord Ashley moved to include them and his motion was carried, Lord John Russell withdrew the bill.[107]

Unfortunately for the promoters of the Ten Hour Movement, both Oastler and Stephens were imprisoned,—Oastler for debt contracted because of his refusal to carry out the Poor Law, and Stephens for taking part in a Chartist meeting. In March, 1840, Lord Ashley moved[108] for a Select Committee to investigate the operation of the Acts and the reports[109] returned showed how much had really been accomplished, as well as how much remained yet to be done.

In 1841, the Tories were returned with Sir Robert Peel the second as Prime Minister. Much was hoped and expected by the friends of the Ten Hour legislation, but developments did not justify their anticipations. Peel apparently feared the independence of thought and speech to which Ashley was given and offered to "shelve" him pleasantly in a position in the royal household,[110] an offer which Ashley as promptly refused.

This year saw the first apparent indication of a determination to restrict the labor of women.[111] Up to that time, agitation had been entirely on behalf of the children but then "they began to realize (the promoters and adherents of a Ten Hours bill) that it was hopeless to get the hours of children increased again to

---

[105] Morley, *Life of Cobden*, ii, p. 300. Cooke-Taylor, *Tour in Manufacturing Districts*, p. 248.

[106] *Hansard* 3rd. S. xlv, c. 434.

[107] *Hansard* 3rd. S. xlix, c. 914.

[108] *Hansard*, 3rd. S. lii, c. 860.

[109] *Report of the Select Committee of Inquiry into the Operation of the Act for the Regulation of Mills and Factories*, 1840, x, 1841, ix.

[110] Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, Vol. I, p. 349-351.

[111] Hutchins and Harrison, *History of Factory Legislation*, p. 66.

ten hours and that restriction on the motive power (hours during which machinery might be in operation) was not yet within the sphere of practical politics and they therefore turned their attention to the women and fought the battle from "behind women's petticoats." They contended that the number of women who were displacing men was increasing and that "home, its cares and its employments, is women's sphere."

For some little time there was a lull in the agitation for a Ten Hour day. The condition of the country was very bad[112] both in commerce and finance; many mills were closed entirely and poverty and misery were prevalent[113] everywhere. Lord Ashley introduced[114] and carried the bill[115] preventing the employment of women and girls in the mines and regulating that of boys at this time and was just prepared to take up the factory question again, when the government announced that it was ready to introduce a bill which would certainly be satisfactory from every standpoint. An interesting session was inevitable, for the rivalry was keen and the friends of the Ten Hour Movement were never better united.[116]

G. THE BILL OF 1844

Sir James Grahame, then Home Secretary, brought in a bill[117] proposing to reduce the hours of labor of children between

---

[112]Cf. Frederic Engels, *Condition of the Working Classes in England in 1844.*

[113]Cf. *Reports of the Select Committee of the Commons,* 1840, x. p. 15 and pp. 48-49. Also 1843, xv, pp. 105-106. The report of Grainger (1843, xv, F 22) tells of the permanently weakened condition which was to be met with among the factory workers around Birmingham. "As in all other manufacturing towns the physical condition is decidedly inferior to that of the agricultural populations." A surgeon of the recruiting station says, "mechanics are shorter, more puny, and altogether inferior in their physical powers—many being distorted in spine and chest. Out of 613 men from Birmingham only 238 could be appointed for service."

[114]*Hansard,* 3rd. S. lv, c. 1260.

[115]*Journal of the House of Commons,* Vol. 97, p. 591, 5 and 6 Victoria, c. xcix.

[116]Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 73.

[117]*Hansard,* 3rd. S. 67, c. 422.

the years of nine and thirteen from eight to six and one-half, either morning or afternoon, the other half day to be free for schooling purposes[118] in schools provided by parochial taxation, which should be under the guidance of the Church of England. The Dissenters opposed this bill almost in a body. Between March 8th and May 1st, 1843, 11,611 petitions were filed with 1,757,297 signatures[119] and the government withdrew the educational clauses.[120]

The other clauses provided that women should be included with "young persons" (13-18) and that night work should be prohibited between the hours of 8 P. M. and 6:30 A. M. in winter and 7 P. M. and 5:30 A. M. in summer. Immediately Lord Ashley moved[121] that the word "night" should be interpreted to mean the hours between 6 P. M. and 6 A. M. which, of course, with the

---

[118]Educational conditions were lamentable. (a) Inspector Horner's report of 1837 (vol. xxxi, p. 47) showed that out of 2,000 children around Manchester whom he tested, 1,067 could not read at all, 322 read with great difficulty and 611 with comparative ease, and that out of 105,000 inhabitants in Oldham and Ashton, 90,000 were factory workers and for these people there was not a single day school to provide even the rudiments of education. (b) Superintendent Baker's report quoted in that of Inspector R. J. Saunders, 1839, vol. 42, p. 60, says, "Factory schools are of many kinds from the coal hole of the engine house to the highest grade of infant education. The engine man, the slubber, the bookkeeper, the burler, the overlooker, the wife of any of these, the small shopkeeper or the next door neighbor, with seven small children on her lap or on the floor, are by turns found teaching the young idea how to shoot in or about their several places of occupation for the two hours daily required by law." He also cites the following as verbatim specimens of "teacher's certificates of attendance," "this is to sertify that 1838 thomas Cordingley as atend martha insep school tow hoors a day Jan. 6" and "the above nemed children has been 12 hours in this school after the Manner of Scollers in this past week." (c) Dr. Nunns writing to Ashley on the condition around Birmingham (*A Letter to Lord Ashley on the Conditions of the Working Classes in 1842*) says, "from the last census reports, seventy-two and one-half per cent of the operatives children are receiving no education whatsoever." (p. 24).

[119]Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, i, p. 457. (Baines called the bill a "declaration of war against Dissenters.") Edward Baines, *The Social, Educational and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts*, London, 1843, p. 9.

[120]*Hansard*, 3rd. S. 69, c. 1567.

[121]*Hansard*, 3rd. S. lxxiii, March 15, 1844.

time allowance necessary for meals would mean a ten hour working day. His amendment was carried despite the opposition of the Ministry,[122] but the crisis came in the attempt to reconcile the second clause of the bill (that which defined "night") with the 8th clause which provided the actual number of working hours. After adjournment for three days, the House met and at once a supporter of the Ministry moved[123] to insert the word "twelve" in the blank before the word hours in the 8th clause. The majority of the House, however, voted it down. Lord Ashley then moved[124] that the word "ten" be inserted. When put to the House, that motion too, was lost. The House found itself in an odd position, having refused to accept either a ten or a twelve hour day. The natural move to be made on the part of the Ministry would have been to substitute "eleven" as a compromise, but Sir James Grahame refused to yield on the question and demanded a twelve hour day. Again the House adjourned for a three day recess and upon reassembling, the ministry, through Sir James Grahame, announced that that bill would be withdrawn[125] and another introduced.[126] The new bill permitted no amendments of time to any of its clauses. In the debate which began on April 10th, Lord Ashley spoke with such vigor, such perfect and complete familiarity with every economic detail that Sir James Grahame did not even make serious attempt to refute his arguments. For over two days the debate continued, but the die was cast when Sir Robert Peel in the conclusion of his speech, evidently beginning to realize that it was quite possible that the Ministry would be rendered a doubtful victory if any, announced[127] "I do not know what the result may be this night, but this I do know, that I shall, with a safe conscience if the re-

---

[122]Peel was both angry and astonished. Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* pp. 80-81.

[123]*Hansard,* 3rd. S. lxxiii, March 18, 1844.

[124]*Ibid.*

[125]Grant, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 84. *Hansard,* 3rd. S. lxxiii, March 22, 1844.

[126]*Ibid.*

[127]*Hansard* 3rd S. lxxiv, May 13, 1844.

sult be unfavorable to my views, retire with perfect satisfaction into a private station, wishing well to the results of your legislation, but for myself, prepared to pursue that more rugged but not inglorious path of duty—prepared to resist concessions which though popular, I believe to be injurious and to consult the public interest at the expense of popular favor."

It was enough,—the majority of the Tories who had opposed Peel, swung into line,[128] "ratted," and the die was cast. Ashley's amendment was lost. Nevertheless, the Ten Hour adherents were satisfied that the realization of all their hopes was not far off.

The Act of 1844[129] provided an entrance age limit of eight (the previous limit had been nine) children from 8 to 13 to work six and one-half hours a day in either the morning or afternoon except when a ten hour day was provided (as was in some cases) for the entire factory,—when they might work ten hours daily on three alternate days in each week. Women and "young persons" (13-18) were to work twelve hours a day between the hours of 5:30 A. M. and 8 P. M. Inspectors were permitted to appoint certifying surgeons in their several districts and the children were to be certified at the factory, the examination to take place before they were employed. No machinery was to be cleaned while in motion and all of it was to be fenced and boxed to save accidents. Added power was vested in the inspectors in regard to the schools, and the hours of work, schooling and meals were to be regulated by a public clock. A register was to be kept and any detail of information sought by the inspector was to be supplied. The question of the "twelve" vs. the "ten" hours was of tremendous moment and the feeling was intense,[130] even after the matter was settled temporarily by Peel's threat of resignation.

The ensuing year, 1845, was quiet. It saw the extension of legislative protection to children, young persons and women

---

[128] *Journal of the House of Commons*, vol. 99, p. 294.

[129] *7 and 8 Victoria*, c. 15.

[130] Greville's *Journal of the Reign of Victoria*, 1837-1852, vol. ii, p. 236. Also *British Quarterly Review*, 1844.

in print works,[131] but no change of principle. The following year an unimportant amendment followed.[132] The Short Time Committees kept closely together,[133] watching the operation of the Act of 1844 and biding their time. Palmerston, Lord John Russell, Howick, and T. B. Macaulay had all become supporters of the bill for ten hours. By a curious and unkindly play of fate, Lord Ashley was out of Parliament when the bill for which he had labored for nearly seventeen years came to its own. Having been elected on protectionist principles[134] and having been converted to free trade, his conscientious scruples led to his resignation, and at the next election he was not returned. The leadership of the movement then fell to John Fielden, who introduced the second reading of the bill[135] which was, however, defeated.[136] By the middle of 1846 the passage of the Corn and Customs bill and the defeat of the "Irish Coercions" bill led to the resignation of Sir Robert Peel, and the Whigs controlled the Ministry. In January of 1847 Fielden moved the introduction[137] of the Ten Hour Bill and, with little discussion and no turmoil, it passed[138] on May 3 and became law[139] June 1.[140] This Act did not affect the labor of children, but limited the work of young persons and women to ten hours a day and eight on Saturdays. It acted as a general reduction on men's labor also, however, since the work of men and women was interdependent.

Great was the rejoicing among those who had been waiting seventeen years for the day. A meeting[141] was held of delegates from the Short Time Committees and other Parliamentary promoters in which thanks were "resolved" to all those who had

[131] *8 and 9 Victoria*, c. 29.
[132] *9 and 10 Victoria*, c. 40.
[133] Grant, *History of Factory Legislation*, p. 118.
[134] *Ibid.*, 122.
[135] *Hansard* 3rd S. 85, c. 1222.
[136] *Ibid.*, 86, c. 1080.
[137] *Ibid.*, 89, c. 187.
[138] *Ibid.*, 92, c. 1363.
[139] *10 and 11 Victoria*, c. 29.
[140] *Journal of the House of Commons*, vol. 102, p. 470.
[141] Grant, *His. Fac. Leg.*, pp. 140-146.

given their efforts towards the success of this cause. The journal, which had supported the Ten Hour movement almost from the first, said,[142] on the next morning, "A great event came off last night in the House of Commons, in a very quiet way. The Ten Hours bill was read a third time and passed without much ado. It is only three years since a powerful ministry staked its very existence against a similar measure. History presents no example of retributive justice so striking or so speedy as that which avenged the wrong and insult done to a powerless and almost speechless body of sufferers. The Conservative majority flung over their factory clients to keep their chief and their party in power with as much indifference as a man will part with a horse which no longer answers his purpose. . . . Exactly three years since, the twelve hours' factory labor were retained as the price for the protection of corn. Brief is the interval, but corn is no longer protected and the twelve hours are doomed to change into ten. It is not to be imagined that there has been any considerable degree of conversion in these years. The argument stands very much where it did and was almost exhausted in the remarkable struggle to which we have just referred. There must, however, be more than common reasons for this fact—that while the question was at the time so warmly discussed and swollen to such colossal importance, it now passes almost unnoticed but literally with not a third of its former opposition to dispute its further progress."

This bill for a ten-hour day affected,[143] after May 1, 1848, 363,796 women and young persons out of a total of 544,876 hands employed. It required amendment, however, for the working hours were still between 5:30 A. M. and 8 P. M., and opportunity was thus given for the mill owners to use both a relay[144] and a shift system, by which a group would be employed for a couple of hours, sent out for an hour or two and kept waiting about until time for their labor to begin again, thus

[142]The London *Times*, May 4, 1847.
[143]Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, ii, p. 194.
[144]*Inspector Horner's Report*, October 31, 1848, p. 95.

making it possible for all sorts of ill behavior to go on and making it impossible for the employees to return home and get settled at some other necessary work. It was a critical time for the bill. Trade depression had been very great during 1847 and it was a great temptation for operatives to ignore the law[145] and work longer, but they seem, for the most part, to have stood firm. The anxiety over the "relay" system and the successful evasion of the law by means of which the mills could be kept running nearly fifteen hours, led to the planning of a test case by the Lancashire Short Time Committee[146] which was decided in favor of the manufacturers in both the inferior and superior courts. It was a great blow to all those who had worked for the jeopardized Act. In Lord Ashley's diary the following entry occurs:[147] "Adverse judgments in the Court of Exchequer. Great remedial measure, the Ten Hours Act, nullified. The work to be done all over again and I, seventeen years older than when I began. But as I did not commence, so neither shall I renew it in my own strength."

He rallied promptly, however, and four days later brought up the question in the Commons, and after a vigorous discussion was allowed to introduce[148] a bill which fixed the hours of the working day as 6 A. M. to 6 P. M. In presenting the bill he read an extract from a communication from Stalybridge, which said:[149] "I have been to-day to see some factories where the so-called relay system is in full work, and have seen such evidence of the evil of that mode of working the people that I cannot refrain from pouring out my feelings to you. In one factory I found 335 young persons and women working by relays; they are sent out at different times of the day, so as to bring their

[145]Hutchins and Harrison, p. 97. In Manchester, out of a total of 179 mills, 92 were working full time, 68 short time, and 17 were closed. And of 41,000 hands, 22,000 were working full time, 13,500 short time, and 5,500 stopped.

[146]Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury,* vol. ii, p. 197.

[147]*Ibid.,* p. 199.

[148]*Hansard* 3rd S. cix, c. 886.

[149]*Ibid.*

actual working to ten hours. They are sent out of the mill without any regard to the distance of their homes or the state of the weather. Some of them, I ascertained, lived two miles off, and then the half-hour, or hour, or two hours, can be turned to no good account. One factory manager said, 'The factory law has never worked so oppressively to the operatives as it does now.'" The arguments against the bill were many and wearing—much of the same ground was covered again, but the bill finally carried[150] and became law.[151] The spirit and the letter of the law were secured.

The relay system for children was not interfered with by this Act, however, as an amendment made by Lord Ashley to include them in the six to six ruling was not carried. In 1853, however, Lord Palmerston introduced[152] a bill for that purpose and the hours during which the six and one-half hours of the daily labor of children must be performed were fixed as 6 A. M. to 6 P. M.[153]

In the light of the story of factory abuses and child slavery one cannot but marvel at the attitude of the able woman economist, Harriet Martineau. Her voicings have been frequently and voluminously quoted but the temptation is great to quote her again. She says,[154] "The mills were fairly wholesome, the owners not oppressors, the pay good, the work not severe or otherwise objectionable and all representations of the case as generally speaking, worse than this, were found to be untrue. But it was too true that parents let out their children to that class of middlemen, the spinners, from whom neither the care of parents nor the consideration of educated masters was to be looked for." And, in speaking of the continued efforts to pro-

---

[150] *Journal of the House of Commons,* 105, p. 452.

[151] *13 and 14 Victoria,* c. 54, August 5, 1850.

[152] Grant (*Hist. of Fac. Leg.,* pp. 74-76) tells a very amusing story of the winning of Lord Palmerston to sympathy with factory legislation.

[153] *16 and 17 Victoria,* c. 104. *Journal of the House of Commons,* 108, p. 847.

[154] Harriet Martineau, *History of the Thirty Years' Peace,* London, 1878, vol. ii, p. 513.

mote factory legislation, she says:[155] "The irritation of this perpetual blister added to the many under which the employers and the laborers were suffering. The mill owners resented this interference in the management of their affairs, which operated as a reduction of value of the machinery which they had put up in the expectation of freedom in making their arrangements, seeing all the time how fruitless must be all attempts to legislate between parents and children and how manufacture must droop under arbitrary restrictions imposed by the legislature."

Her slurs at Lord Ashley, too, were petty,[156] "By this time it had become the custom in Parliament to praise Lord Ashley's philanthropy and declare expressly a belief that it was unquestionably sincere—a practice which led to an impression of its being questioned by somebody."

And her entire misunderstanding of the economic aspect of social legislation shows a fundamental lack of comprehension of the power that social emotion will always have to interfere with the equations of pure economy, and to force a reformulation.

The story of factory reform in behalf of children has not yet, nearly seven decades later, reached the point where it is a subject for serene complacency[157] on the part of a civilized world. We have not moved very far from the days when a nation laid the brunt of its factory toil on the shoulders of babes—but much has been accomplished and the future holds fair promise. Since the passage of the Ten Hour bill little argument has been cited against the principle of social legislation. With increased power of the people there comes the recognition of social legislation as one of the first functions for which

---

[155] *Ibid.*, iii, p. 487.

[156] *Ibid.*, iv, p. 206.

[157] In a recent issue of the *Survey* there was a significant little quatrain sent by Miss Cleghorn, who was investigating mill conditions in the South:

"The golf links lie so near the mill,
That almost every day,
The children at their labor,
May watch the men at play."

government exists, not as one of the activities in which it may indulge. With the growing strength of the social idea, with the increased demands which the governed are making as the price of their consent to be governed, the static recognition of children as assets of the state is fast becoming a dynamic conception and the possibilities latent in the eighty-four years still remaining of this century of the child, hold promises which the growing recognition of social integration may lead to conversion into fact.

2. Antecedents of the Chief Promoters of Factory Laws for Children

The story of the antecedents of those who gave energy, time, strength, and money in an effort to secure laws to protect the laboring factory children of England during the very late eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, is a story very like that of the promoters of legislation in behalf of chimney sweeps.

The number of those whose affiliations were sympathetic was very large, but the names which represent the greatest public effort and responsibility are but eleven in number.

The first name on the roll is that of (a) Dr. Percival, of Manchester, who organized the Manchester Board of Health and framed its resolutions, expressing belief in the great need of Parliamentary interference in behalf of the child laborers, and complete change in the conditions of the labor. Dr. Percival was a Dissenter, in later life a strong Unitarian. His confrere, (b) John Aikin, who wrote concerning conditions in and around Manchester and told of the ill results of factory labor upon children, was also a Dissenter. (c) Sir Robert Peel (the first), to whom is owing the establishment of the principle of government interference in "business," was an Anglican. He was not noble by birth, but was granted the peerage because of his services (chiefly pecuniary) to his Government. (d) Robert Owen, to whom was due the first suggestion for regulation of

the "free" child laborers in factories (bill of 1819), was a Deist, a believer in the infinite natural capacities of mankind and the development or destruction of those capacities in accord with the environment in which man was placed. His experiment in proving his theories is told in the chapter on Owen, and further information concerning his views is to be found there. He was much influenced by French thought, but the sources through which he came in contact with the views of the philosophes are nowhere evident. This first bill, while suggested by Owen and sponsored by Peel (the first), was strongly supported in Parliament by Sir Francis Burdett, who, though probably an Anglican, had been much influenced in all thought by his experiences in France in the Revolution, by Messrs. John and William Smith, both Dissenters; by Wynn, an Anglican; and by Wilberforce, the great Evangelical leader. (e) John Cam Hobhouse, who fathered the bill of 1825, was probably a Dissenter if he had any religious affiliations. His mother was a Dissenter and he had been sent to a Unitarian school. He was an intimate of Byron. (f) Richard Oastler was himself an Anglican. His father, Robert, had been a very strong Methodist and personal friend of Wesley, and the son had been educated at a Moravian school. According to "Alfred" (i, p. 94), Baines, a personal friend but political opponent of Oastler, said: "Mr. Oastler is a kind of hereditary supporter of benevolence, as he inherited it from his father." (g) Joseph Rayner Stephens, who spoke and wrote (*The Political Christian Pulpit*) and was even imprisoned because of his activity in behalf, not only of children but of laboring men who were seeking to form "combinations," was a young Wesleyan minister when he first decided that the cause of the laboring children was a matter vital to the purposes of Christianity. (h) George S. Bull, who was a member of the Short Time Committees and extremely active in efforts for the children, was the Anglican rector of the town of Bradford. (i) John Fielden, who took Ashley's place in the struggle for the Ten Hour Bill when Ashley was out of Parliament, was the son of a Quaker, but became himself in later life a Unitarian. (j) Michael Sadler, to whom

the original introduction into Parliament of the Ten Hour Bill is due, was an Anglican, but had been from young boyhood much influenced by the Evangelical movement and sympathized greatly with its aims. The family of his boyhood had suffered some obloquy for their sympathetic attitude toward Methodists and Sadler himself as a boy of seventeen, wrote a pamphlet in their defence, entitled, *An Apology for Methodists,* Stockport, 1797. (k) Lord Ashley, to whom more than to anyone else, perhaps, final success was due, was, as has been said (cf. Notes on Personnel of the Promoters of Chimney Sweep Legislation), a member of the Anglican church but was very much under the influence of and greatly in sympathy with the Evangelical movement.

To summarize—of the eleven names which indicate those whose services were most prominent and probably most vital, two represent those whose identification with the Anglican Church was apparently uninfluenced by any other religious or philosophic interest, Peel and Bull—one, Owen, was a Deist; two, Sadler and Ashley, are Anglican, but Anglican much influenced by the Evangelical movement; one, Oastler, was an Anglican, but with a background of Methodism; the other five, Percival, Aikin, John Cam Hobhouse (probably), Joseph Rayner, Stephens, and John Fielden, were all Dissenters from Anglicanism.

If those are included who supported the first legislation (it has been deemed just to include their names for consideration and to omit the names of those who spoke in favor of later bills because of the complexities surrounding politics after the second decade of the century, complexities which must have influenced the votes of Parliamentary members but which could hardly be considered dominant in the minds of the original promoters of the specific bills)—if those names are included the list adds one Anglican, Wynn—an Anglican (probably) much influenced by French thought, Sir Francis Burdett—two Dissenters, John and Wm. Smith—and one Evangelical, Wilberforce.

IV

ROBERT OWEN AND NEW LANARK

1. The Institution and Its Background[1]

No sketch, however slight, of the history of child protection in England, may omit the story of Robert Owen and his eager efforts in behalf of all children, especially for those immediately connected with his factories in New Lanark in Scotland.

With aggressively fervent faith in the infinite possibilities latent in even the humblest of mankind, he voiced his belief, not only in words, but in the creation of practical opportunities by means of which his factory population could prove that his confidence was not misplaced.

He stands as a beacon in that period of the industrial revolution when society with old methods and systems already shaken or even overthrown by the French Revolution, was groping blindly and awkwardly toward readjustment of her social-economic mechanism to meet industrial changes as yet neither fully realized nor completely understood. Wealth had increased with tremendous rapidity and largely in a class unfamiliar with

[1]The work of Robert Owen is a concrete expression of the influence of the French philosophic movement of the eighteenth century. While there is no evidence that he had read *Emile,* or the *Social Contract* (indeed, with his belief in government and its rightful powers, he could not have known the latter)—no proof that Voltaire had moulded his conceptions of religion—no sign that he had even heard of Condorcet and his *Tableau Historique des Progrès de l'Esprit Humain,* there can be no doubt that from some such source, second-hand perhaps, but undeniable—English reflections of French thought it may be—he acquired those ideas whose enunciation in the abstract took shape in his *Essays on the Formation of the Human Character,* and whose concrete expression, modified by the gentle beneficence and kindly tenderness of a simple practical man, gave to the world the working models for substance and form in social ideas.

> "Wandering between two worlds, one dead,
> The other powerless to be born."

wealth, indeed more accustomed to a background of poverty. Moreover, the belief in social responsibility for private wealth was nowhere recognized if anywhere enunciated.

In this period of intense confusion, Owen was, as Miss Hutchins calls him,[2] a pathfinder,—

He was the pioneer in industrial reform, the van leader in the nineteenth century revolt against *laissez faire,* a revolt in which even the church was compelled to take its share in registered protest[3] against a doctrine of unregulated and unrestricted competition in economics, and a system of ethics based on an asserted inexorable necessity of self-seeking.[4] He proved for all time that social ideas were neither chimerical nor impractical, as working bases for a commonplace world.

That he became, after middle life, an extremist, a propagandist of a utopian communal reorganization of industry, an

---

[2]B. L. Hutchins, *Fabian Tract* No. 166, p. 2.

[3]E. R. A. Seligman, "Robert Owen and the Christian Socialists," *Pol. Science Quar.,* vol. 1, p. 492.

[4]Toynbee sums up the *laissez faire* theory as "Man's Self-love is God's Providence." *Industrial Revolution,* p. 11.

Malthus gave very definite expression to this theory when he says, "By making the passion of self-love beyond comparison stronger than the passion of benevolence, the more ignorant are led to pursue the general happiness, an end they would have totally failed to attain if the ruling principle of their conduct had been benevolence. Benevolence, indeed, as the great and constant source of action, would require the most perfect knowledge of causes and effects, and therefore can only be the attribute of the Deity. In a being so short-sighted as man it would lead to the grossest of errors, and soon transform the fair and cultivated soil of human society into a dreary scene of want and confusion." *Essay on the Principle of Population,* 1872, App. p. 492, 7th ed.

Malthus forged another particularly effective weapon for capitalistic opposition to remedial legislation, in his theory that, as the means of subsistence did not keep pace with the growth of population, the causes (imprudent marriage and large families) of the misery and social degradation of the masses lay at their own door and hence were not to be allayed by legislation. This made excellent argument to clear capitalistic skirts of unpleasing responsibility. Cf. Cunningham, *Laissez Faire,* 1912 ed., Text and Notes, pp. 742-745, and Perris, *Industrial History of Modern England,* pp. 183-200, for interpretations of Malthusian economy in the light of social and economic conditions.

exponent of weird economics and unsound monetary theory,[5] a bitter and violent antagonist of all religious creeds,[6] a believer in spiritualistic manifestations—all this may not minimize the tremendous practical and permanent services which his young manhood rendered to humanity.

The eighteenth century had brought fundamental changes in economic conditions. The growing wealth of the merchant class had operated, perhaps more than any other motive, in leading the nobles and country squires to conserve the wealth attainable through the improved methods of agriculture and the political power that went with land, by dispossessing the small freeholder. These lands they enclosed, as well as the wastes and commons, so long freely enjoyed by the laboring classes. The yeomen had usually carried on cottage industries of spinning and weaving[7] and when dispossessed of the land these were the only support.[8] The latter part of the eighteenth century, however, had brought upheaval in the textile industries as well, through the inventions of the spinning jenny, the mule, the water frame, and later, the power loom. These machines, large and expensive, could not be bought by the average cottager and his difficulties were increased by the fact that the source of the raw material, like the market for the finished product, was no longer domestic but foreign, since cotton had superseded wool and even linen in textile manufacture.[9] No longer could the weaver go to the nearest market, procure the raw materials, set his entire family to work on some portion of the spinning-weaving process, and carry the finished product back to his market. Large buildings containing the

---

[5]*The Life of Robert Owen, Written by Himself,* London, 1857-1858. App. S. p. 266. Also the *Economist* and the *Gazette of the Exchange Bazars.* Extensive quotations of Owen's views on these subjects may be found in *Observations on Currency and Finance,* Philadelphia, 1826.

[6]Owen was a Deist. See summary at the end of the chapter.

[7]Toynbee, *Industrial Revolution,* p. 53. "Manufactures were little concentrated in towns and only partially separated from agriculture."

[8]Defoe, *Tour,* vol. iii, p. 97-101.

[9]Radcliffe, *Origin of the New System of Manufactures,* p. 61, quoted by Cunningham, *Laissez Faire,* p. 625.

machinery began to appear, "factories as they are beginning to be called," [10] usually in districts (towns) where coal was readily available,[11] and the country life of spinner and weaver was largely a thing of the past. Although hand-loom weaving was not seriously interfered with before the 30's, the weavers lived around the factories in order to secure the factory-spun thread, which was smoother and finer than the home product.[12]

Parents of this century[13] were perfectly familiar with child labor within the home[14] and early apprenticeship of parish children was regarded as legitimate economy on the part of parish officials as well as commendatory prevention of the evils due to idle hands.[15]

But never before the late eighteenth century had the labor of children been systematized and excessive. Tiny fingers and slender bodies were well adapted for working around machinery, while the cheapness of the labor and the impossibility of "combination" among the children, made them desirable to the manufacturers from every standpoint. So large numbers, some six, five years of age, and even in some cases younger, were herded together in overheated factories where they labored twelve, thirteen, fourteen, even fifteen and sixteen hours a day—the hours and conditions of their work subject to nothing but the individual character or caprice of the employer.[16]

In his early manhood Robert Owen became manager of the factory of Mr. Drinkwater, in Manchester, an establishment where there were about five hundred men, women, and children

---

[10] *Auto. of Robert Owen* (about the year 1790), p. 24.

[11] Chiefly in Lancashire and Yorkshire.

[12] Cunningham, *Laissez Faire,* p. 632 et sq.

[13] O. J. Dunlop, *English Apprenticeship and Child Labor,* p. 262.

[14] For some years it was socially discreditable for parents to permit their daughters to work in a factory. "Alfred," *History of the Factory Movement,* vol. I, p. 16.

[15] Cf. Harrison and Hutchins, *History of Factory Legislation,* p. 3, for citations from T. Woods, *Account of the Shrewsbury House of Industry* (1795), and Robert Potter's *Observations on the Poor Law* (1775).

[16] Cf. *The Report of the Committee (Peel's Committee) of 1816.*

employed.[17] In these same years he became a member of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, whose founder, Dr. Percival, a leading physician of Manchester had been especially interested in the mill conditions of child labor and its effects on the children and who, from 1795 on, had been calling public attention to the situation, insisting that regulations should be made by the state.[18] He, with certain associates, formed the Manchester Board of Health, and it is probable that their discussions and resolutions[19] had very definite, if unconscious, influence in moulding the views and mapping the courses of Robert Owen.[20] About 1800, when twenty-eight years of age, Mr. Owen left Manchester and became partner and manager of the mills of New Lanark on the Clyde in Scotland—mills purchased from David Dale,[21] the man afterwards to become Owen's father-in-law.[22] The property was a typical manufacturing village, full of drunkenness, theft, immorality, and filth,—and antagonistic to Owen as a "foreigner." [23] Under Mr. Dale the inhabitants were comparatively few, hence the mill

---

[17] *Autobiography,* p. 28.

[18] *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

[19] Resolutions of January 25, 1796, republished in the *Report of Peel's Committee,* 1816, p. 377.

[20] The seemingly widespread impression that Owen's views were directly formed from Rousseau or from that school does not find apparent substantiation in a study of Owen's autobiography, nor of his speeches—and his son, Robert Dale Owen, says of him (*Threading My Way,* Robert Dale Owen, New York, 1874, p. 88), "Robert Owen had none of the advantages of regulated study. In this way he worked out his problems for human improvement to great disadvantage, missing a thousand things which great minds had thought and said before his time and mistaking ideas that were truly his own, for novelties that no human being had heretofore given to the world."

[21] According to Robert Owen (*Autob.,* p. 55) Dale was a pastor (unpaid) of a dissenting sect—according to R. D. Owen (*Threading My Way,* p. 37) his grandfather was of strict Presbyterian principles.

[22] Despite the great difference in their attitudes to religion, Owen and Mr. Dale were the best of friends, and Mr. Dale would end his arguments with an affectionate, "Thou needest be very right, for thou art very positive." (*Autob.,* p. 72.)

[23] *Autob. of Robert Owen,* p. 62.

workers had to be introduced from outside. They were largely children brought from the Directors of Charity in Glasgow and Edinburgh, who would not give them up unless taken as early as six, seven, or eight years of age. These children were comfortably housed, fed, and clothed[24] and *after seven* in the evening, their working day having lasted from 6 A. M. to 7 P. M., they received instruction from the very well-intentioned plans of Mr. Dale. It does not seem strange that the weary, sometimes dwarfed and deformed, children often ran away to Edinburgh or Glasgow as soon as their apprenticeships expired, although there is no question but that David Dale was a model employer of his time.

Owen determined that no more pauper children should be received, but that their places should be supplied from new families brought into the village, no children under ten, however, to be allowed to work in the mill. The village itself was to undergo great changes,—the filth was cleared away, streets improved, old houses repaired and new ones built, and Owen gave unwearying thought and effort to "seek out the evil and inferior conditions and to supersede them with superior and good conditions." [25] A man, remarkable for his business and administrative powers, seldom mistaken in concrete affairs, however far afield abstract theories might lead him, Owen moved slowly and with no violence[26] towards the ends which he desired to accomplish in New Lanark.

---

[24]In the *Annual Register*, 1782, Part II, p. 33, is a laudation of Dale's management. Also, George J. Holyoake, *Self Help a Hundred Years Ago* (128-134), and the *Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor*, vol. 2.

[25]*Autob. of Owen*, p. 58.

[26]It is interesting to see how Owen, a man whose enthusiasms might have been expected to win the adjective "mad," was absolutely free from any evidence of contention or violence of any kind. Griscom says of him (*A Year in Europe*, vol. 2, p. 251), "His manners are altogether unobtrusive, he wishes to gain his point by illustration and persuasion." And at the Centenary Festival of Owen's birth (*Reports of the Proceedings of the Festival in Commemoration of the Centenary Birthday of Robert Owen*, London, 1871, p. 18), Lloyd Jones, a friend and biographer of Owen, quotes

Conditions improved steadily; the village and then the homes were cleaned,[27] the grog shops were abolished, the families were better fed and better clothed through the shop which Owen established, where all necessities could be bought at cost, the children between the ages of five and ten attended the village school and when, during a four months' embargo of the United States, Owen was forced to close the mills and yet continued to pay full wages to the employees (a sum amounting to 7,000 pounds) the last vestige of their distrust faded away and they were willing to follow him in anything.[28] Keenly interested as he was in the welfare of the village community, the heart of his interest lay with the children, not only because of his genuine love for humanity, beneficent and kindly as he was by nature, but because he saw in them the instruments of proof to the world of theories which he believed to be destined to regenerate mankind, views which he expressed with dogmatic simplicity and which he believed incapable of qualification.

"Man is the creature of circumstance," [29] and again,—"Any general character, from the best to the worst, from the most ignorant to the most enlightened, may be given to any community, even to the world at large, by the application of a proper means; which means are to a great extent at the command and

---

him as saying, "Be charitable and forbearing. Put whatever is wrong, right with as little delay as possible, but do so without angry impatience and without injury of any kind to any person, when in any way it can be avoided."

[27]An amusing account of the house cleaning process and the visits of the village committees (called "bug hunters" by the irate village women) to investigate the state of the houses is given in *Robert Owen at New Lanark,* p. 129.

[28]Robert Dale Owen, *Threading My Way,* p. 195, "My father's outburst against religion brought a certain measure of ostracism. He lost caste in the eyes of the influential classes, but never with the working class"; and the *Westminster Review* of April, 1839, said, "The principles of Robert Owen are in one form or another the actual creed at the present time of a great portion of the working classes."

[29]Griscom in his *Year in Europe,* vol. ii, p. 253, speaks of Owen's frequent use of this expression.

under the control of those who have an influence in the affairs of men.[30]

To him no argument could be cited in favor of inherited tendencies; he seems to have come independently to the knowledge that men could not inherit acquired characteristics,—"Man becomes a wild, ferocious savage, a cannibal or highly civilized being, according to the circumstances in which he may be placed at his birth. Were we to convey a number of infants as soon as they were born from this country into distant regions and there deliver them to the natives of that country and allow them to remain there; they would become one and all like those natives whatever their characters might be." "Were an exchange of any given number of children to be made between the Society of Friends and the loose fraternity inhabiting St. Giles in England, the children of the former would grow up like the members of the latter, prepared for every degree of crime, while those of the latter would become the same temperate, good moral characters as the former." [31] Again and again he reiterates, "the character of man is formed *for* him and not *by* him." [32] He denied utterly man's will as a morally responsible being, and it is in the endeavor to form the character of the children of New Lanark that he seeks to justify his doctrine to the world.

Owen's views were not new.[33] Condorçet, Abbé Sieyès, Rousseau, Thomas Paine, Godwin, had all said very much the same thing and in a fashion much less crude; but, granted that the ideas of Owen were not original, there is not the slightest suggestion that his absorption of them from any source was a

---

[30] Essay I, *On the Principle of the Formation of Human Character*, p. 11 (Ed. 1813).

[31] *Autob. of Owen*, App. A, p. 250. Speech at a dinner given in 1812 in Glasgow to Joseph Lancaster.

[32] Griscom in *A Year in Europe*, vol. 2, p. 253, mentions Owen's axiomatic use of the expression. Also, *Life*, p. 30, 58, 62, 191, 224, etc.

[33] Griscom, *A Year in Europe*, vol. 2, p. 258, "Owen makes no fake claims to originality. It delights him to find that other persons have held the same doctrines that he does."

conscious one. He himself tells how Francis Place,[34] who knew his opinions on mankind, found one day in his library an old pamphlet by John Bellers, dated 1696, and expressing much the same views as those expressed by Owen. He sent it to Owen, who was interested and delighted in the similarity of views reached and expressed independently by Bellers and himself a century and a half apart, and who immediately had a thousand copies of the Bellers pamphlet printed and circulated.[35]

The conditions which Owen brought about in the village life[36] were a source of tremendous interest to the thinking people of the United Kingdom.[37] But Owen's mind was continually playing around plans for the children,—plans which would serve the mill, for he was a consummate business man, and which should promote directly the welfare of the children the development of whose latent possibilities he felt to be much retarded by their early home conditions and "irrational" bringing up.[38]

The wide range of subjects discussed in the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, to which he had belonged,[39] had familiarized him with the educational movements of the day, and he had been especially interested in the schools of Joseph

---

[34] See Place's opinion of Owen quoted by Graham Wallas in his *Life of Francis Place,* p. 63.

[35] *Autob.,* App. L, p. 155.

[36] *Report of the Leeds Deputation of 1819, Autob. of Owen,* App. R, p. 253. The rules established for the proper behavior, cleanliness, etc., of the inhabitants are given in *New Existence of Man Upon the Earth* (1854), Part v, App. p. xi.

[37] "It may be supposed," Owen says, "that this community was separated from other society, but the supposition would be erroneous for it had daily and hourly communication with a population exceeding itself. The royal borough of Lanark is only one mile distant from the works. Many individuals come daily from the former to be employed at the latter, and a general intercourse is constantly maintained between the old and new towns." *Cooperative Magazine and Monthly Herald,* London, 1826 and 1827, footnote, p. 97 (1826).

[38] *Autob.,* p. 83.

[39] According to the records of the society, Owen was elected in 1793 and attended regularly until 1798. (Quoted from Podmore's *Life of Owen,* vol. i, p. 58).

Lancaster the Quaker, and Andrew Bell the Anglican, for the benefit of the poor children of London. To these he had subscribed liberally,[40] but the plan of his infant school seems to have been in his mind almost from the beginning of his connection with New Lanark, a plan in no way similar to those of the London schools.

His partners at New Lanark, despite steady profits in the business, were alarmed at the extent to which Owen wished to carry his ideas for the benefit of the working population, and when he proposed to erect a building for the "Formation of Character" at an initial cost of five thousand pounds,[41] to which an appreciable sum for maintenance must be added annually, they opposed him seriously and he with certain others bought out these partners for eighty-four thousand pounds (1809). His new associates proved even more unsympathetic to his ideas, however, insisting that commercial profit, not social welfare, was the purpose of the mills, and finally making an effort to eject Owen entirely. They forced a sale of the mills, claiming that they had so depreciated in value under Owen's management that they were not worth forty thousand pounds and they planned to buy them in for some such sum, believing that Owen was helpless. But Owen had been preparing and circulating a pamphlet setting forth the economic status of the mills, his plans for the welfare of the workers, his belief in the added profits which would accrue from the improved condition of the people, and his need of partners who, sympathizing with his plans, would join him in carrying them out.[42] Excellent as was his business

---

[40] *Autob.*, p. 84. Dr. Lancaster had aroused much interest in his Southwark school for poor children. They were taught by rote in large numbers and controlled by a monitor system. Both Lancaster and Bell used the economic pupil-teacher system, the older pupils teaching the younger. Later years discredit the educational value of these schools as Owen himself did shortly. *New Existence of Man Upon Earth*, Part ii, App. D. p. 85 (1855).

[41] *Autob.*, p. 86.

[42] Owen was among the first to express definitely his belief, now become a business axiom, that the success of an industry is greatly determined by the conditions among the workers.

reputation,[43] it is fair to believe that that consideration weighed less with the partners who rallied to him than the fact that they were to have an opportunity to promote the welfare of a community. However that may be, he secured six partners who bid in the mills for 114,100[44] pounds and the field for his experiment lay open before him.[45]

The demonstration of New Lanark inhabitants to Owen and his Quaker partners upon their return, evinced the love and trust in which they held him.[46]

By this time (1813) Owen had published his four essays

[43]The mortification of his partners at failing to secure the mills may be well understood when the books of the mills showed a net profit between the years 1809-1813, of 160,000 pounds. (*Autob.*, p. 98.)

[44]The partners had been so certain that they would secure the mills that they had prepared a banquet to celebrate the event. Among the guests was a Col. Hunter, who, although a friend, had been wide awake to the plan which had been (so badly) engineered. The banquet, a sorry affair, was held, since everything was prepared, and Col. Hunter took great delight in annoying the defeated partners with his toasts to these "splendid business men who could sell a business worth only forty thousand pounds for 114,100 pounds." *Autob.*, p. 92.

The personnel of these six partners is interesting and enlightening. They were John Walker, Joseph Foster, and William Allen—Quakers; Joseph Fox, a Dissenter; Michael Gibbs, an Anglican (afterward Lord Mayor of London); and Jeremy Bentham. The opinions of Mr. Owen and Mr. Bentham concerning each other are worth citing: "Jeremy Bentham spent a long life in an endeavor to amend laws, all based on a fundamental error, without discovering his error, and therefore was this life, although a life of incessant, well-intended industry, occupied in showing and attempting to remedy the evils of individual laws, but never attempting to dive to the foundation of all laws, thus ascertaining the cause of the errors and evils of them." *Autob. of Owen*, p. 95. "Owen," says Bentham (*Collected Works*, Bowring Ed. x, p. 570), "begins in a vapor and ends in smoke. He is a great braggadocio, and he avoids coming to particulars. He is always the same,—says the same thing over again. He built some small houses and the people who had no houses of their own went to live in those houses,—and this he calls success."

Attention must be called to the fact, however, that Bentham never visited the mills and that Owen was told by friends of Bentham that his purchase of stock in the New Lanark mills was the only successful investment Bentham ever made. *Autob.*, p. 96.

[45]*Autob.*, p. 94 et sqq., (1813).

[46]*Autob.*, p. 97.

on the *Formation of Character,*[47] and they had aroused much interest and argument, among the leaders of the period.[48] In the address prefixed to the third essay[49] he urges the superintendents of factories to turn their thoughts from their inanimate to their living machines, to expend time and money to improve the living instruments of their industry,—"an investment which will result in formed character and increased comfort of the workers, and in essential additions to your own gains." [50] By this time Owen was thoroughly aroused over conditions which he knew existed in the cotton manufacture.[51] In 1815 he called a meeting of the manufacturers of Scotland to be held at the Tontine in Glasgow and there he urged the necessity of appealing to the government to remove the duty on raw cotton and to legislate for the protection of child workers.[52] The first proposal was received with great enthusiasm, the second,—coldly. "Only since the introduction of the cotton manufacture[53] have children and adults had to labor twelve and more hours a day. Children are now put to work in the factories at seven or even five and six years of age, and they have not even the rudiments of education." [54]

---

[47] *Autob.,* App. B, p. 255.

[48] These included Wilberforce, Godwin, Lord and Lady Liverpool, Archbishop of Canterbury (Sutton), Sir Thomas Bernard, Ricardo, Malthus, Francis Place, the first Sir Robert Peel, the Bishop of Durham, James Mill, Col. Torrens, etc. John Neill and Francis Place are said to have revised these essays; G. J. Holyoake, *Sixty Years in An Agitator's Life,* p. 120.

[49] *Autob.,* App. B, p. 259.

[50] Again the idea of the importance to the industry of the condition of the workers.

[51] "Bad and unwise as American slavery is, the white slavery in the manufactories of Europe was at this period far worse than the slaves whom I afterwards saw in the West Indies and the United States and in many respects, especially as regards health, food, and clothing, the latter were much better provided for than were those oppressed and degraded children and work people in the home factories of Great Britain." *Autob.,* p. 112 et sq.

[52] *Autob.,* p. 113, et sq.

[53] "Observations on the Cotton Trade," *Glasgow Chronicle,* Jan. 27, 1815.

[54] Others felt that conditions of labor were not so hard as they had been a generation before. Cook-Taylor, *Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire,* p. 141.

When Owen realized the temper of the manufacturers he determined to see what he himself could do. In order to procure trustworthy evidence he took his son Robert Dale Owen and made a tour of the largest manufacturing establishments of Great Britain. "The facts were terrible beyond belief.[55] As a general rule the children of ten years were working fourteen hours a day with a half-hour at mid-day for luncheon. In some cases we found conditions utterly disgraceful to a civilized nature. Mills were running sixteen hours a day with children of eight and under, in a single shift. Most of the overseers openly carried stout leathern thongs and we frequently saw even the youngest children severely beaten. In some large factories from one fourth to one half the children were either cripples or otherwise deformed or permanently injured by excessive toil, sometimes by brutal abuse." How impartial these findings were, it is difficult to judge. Owen then framed a bill[56] which the first Sir Robert Peel (himself responsible for the Apprentice Act of 1802, the utterly futile 42 Geo. III. c. 73) agreed to present.[57] Naturally enough, the success of Owen as a master manufacturer combined with his actual accomplishments in the New Lanark institutions stirred the Commons to interest in his measure and investigation of conditions as could not otherwise have been hoped. The bill was to apply to cotton, silk, wool and flax mills and provided an entrance age limit of ten, the children to work only six hours daily between the ages of ten and twelve, and every child under eighteen was to receive one half hour's instruction daily. No one under eighteen was to be employed more than ten and one half hours a day, exclusive of meal times, and inspection was to be by paid and quali-

---

[55]Robert Dale Owen, *Threading My Way*, p. 125.

[56]The full story of the Parliamentary proceedings concerning this bill is found in the chapter headed *Factory Legislation for Children Through 1853.*

[57]Lauderdale who seems to have put himself on record as opposing every possible move which could in any way benefit the working classes, (See the attitude of Lauderdale on the question of protection for the Chimney Sweepers) asserted that "Sir Robert Peel never thought of this bill until Robert Owen put it into his mind." *Hansard* xxxix, c. 656.

fied inspectors. The bill was first challenged with the classic objection to interference by governmental powers in the management of business affairs[58] and this having been overruled, the attempt was made to prove that it was not injurious for young children to work fourteen or fifteen hours a day in overheated close rooms. Sir Robert Peel then consented to the appointment of a committee to investigate this, and "the committee was continued for two sessions of Parliament before these wise and honest men could decide that these practices were detrimental to the health of these infants."[59]

The fate of the bill was a sorry one. At the very beginning it was decided that it should apply only to cotton mills although flax mills were the worst offenders at this particular time, and little by little it was robbed of its strength. In 1819, when it became an Act,[60] the entrance age limit was nine, the working day twelve hours, and inspection was to be carried on by justices.[61] Owen was so disgusted at the way matters proceeded that he "abandoned the further progress of the bill and left it to its mutilated fate."[62] The bill had not accomplished what its originator had intended, but that fact can not dim the greatness of the achievement. Owen had produced a revolution in the attitude of

---

[58]Owen makes every effort to demolish laissez faire arguments. "If the operatives in our factories were really free,—it might be less necessary to legislate on this subject (the protection of children), but are they in anything but appearance free laborers? Would they not in fact be compelled to work the customary hours though they were twenty? What alternative have they or what freedom is there in the case but the liberty of starving? . . . My firm conviction is that our present practices are destitute of everything which deserves the name of comfort or happiness among our work people—that they are most ruinous to the best interests of our country and ten times more powerful opponents to our success as manufacturers than all the competition which it is possible for foreign nations to create against us." Here he also emphasizes the justice and the necessity for a living wage. *Letter to the British Manufacturers* in 1818, *Autob.*, App. p. 200, et sq.

[59]*Autob.*, p. 117.

[60]*59 George III*, c. 66.

[61]Cotton Mill Act as proposed by Owen and as passed by Parliament. *Autob.*, App. G.

[62]*Autob.*, p. 121.

Parliament toward the working classes, a Parliament nervously afraid of making a single move which economists asserted would be detrimental to the commercial welfare of the realm,—and if modern factory legislation may be said to be founded upon the ideas of any one man, the title belongs to Robert Owen. But the story of what Owen "proved by doing" is an even happier contribution to the history of humanitarianism.

From the time when he first came to New Lanark, the improvements in the village had begun. No children under ten were received in the mills, and parents were urged to keep their children in school until twelve years of age. Not until 1816, however, had he been able to persuade his partners to require *only* ten and three quarter hours exclusive of meal times, as a working day, but nevertheless the New Lanark mills were models of their time.

On New Year's day 1816, Owen opened his infant school, the concrete means by which he sought to begin with the greatest advantage, the formation of the child character. He has been accused with some animus, of having secured all his ideas from Pestalozzi, from Oberlin or from Fellenberg, but while there can be no doubt that the later life of the school was affected by ideas which he gleaned during his trip to the continent[63] in 1818, New Lanark including its infant school, was unique in its day and has served as a source for innumerable suggestions worked out wholly or in part in the social economics of another generation. It was a social laboratory.[64]

---

[63]Owen went to the continent in 1818 in company with Professor Pictet, of Geneva, who had visited Owen at New Lanark, and with Cuvier, the French naturalist. He was much in the company of Alex. Humboldt and La Place during most of his stay in Paris and seems to have met most of the social celebrities of southern Europe as well as of France. He seems to have been especially interested in his tour of the schools of Switzerland.

[64]There seems to be no doubt but that Owen was the originator of the "infant school." Wilderspin to whom it is sometimes credited, says in the first edition of his work on infant education (1825) (p. 233-234), "As far as I know, Mr. Owen is the first person with whom the idea originated of educating infant children upon an extensive scale." Quoted in *Autob.*, App. A. a.

The school at New Lanark was conducted on certain fundamental principles[65] which were believed to be the most salutary foundation for the development of a "rational character." The children were governed entirely by kindness; neither punished nor scolded, nor spoken to except with pleasant voice and manner. No rewards nor praise were given,—and a child who behaved improperly was regarded as an object of pity, not of blame. Owen tried to impress the community with the feeling that individual happiness is intimately connected with community happiness and that whatever in its ultimate consequences increased the happiness of the community was right and that whatever lessened that happiness was wrong. His ideas seem to have been especially effective in the entire absence of quarrelsomeness among the children which was noted by every visitor.[66] There were about 600 children in the school, 300 day pupils from two to ten or twelve years of age, and 300 evening pupils. The "infant school" naturally roused especial interest since it was a new departure in educational conceptions. It seems to have partaken of the nature of a day nursery as well as a kindergarten, for in the opening address Owen called attention to the fact that "the mothers will be enabled to earn a better maintenance or support for the children, having less care and anxiety about them,"[67] and Griscom, the New York professor of chemistry who visited New Lanark, remarks, that "this baby school is of utmost importance to the establishment, for it enables mothers to shut up their houses in security, and to attend to their duties in the factory without concern for their families."[68] From the time of entrance, often at eighteen months, the children were in charge of a young woman who kept them happy and properly cared for in an out of door enclosure in fair weather (Owen seems to have had a 20th century respect for

---

[65]R. D. Owen, *Outline of the System of Education at New Lanark*, 1824, p. 9.

[66]*Report of the Leeds Deputation, Autob.*, App. R. p. 253.

[67]*Address delivered to the Inhabitants of New Lanark*, on Jan. 1st, 1816, p. 13.

[68]Griscom, *A Year in Europe*, vol., ii, p. 250.

oxygen) and in stormy weather, in a large room inside the building. From two to five years of age the children were taught their letters and facts concerning natural objects around them,[69] and their playroom was furnished with paintings of animals and with natural objects brought from the woods, fields and gardens, but no toys were considered necessary. An American visiting the place gives a pretty picture of Owen surrounded by the babies of the infant school who "as he entered ran to seize him by the hand or coat tail with the most artless simplicity."[70] Of these babies and children under ten there were in 1819, about 500.[71]

As might be expected, Owen had difficulty in finding satisfactory teachers who would carry out his ideas and who had learning free from pedantry combined with love for children and unlimited patience. He found, at last, the desired combination of patience and love of children in the person of James Buchanan, an uneducated weaver, "who had been previously trained by his wife to perfect subjection to her will,"[72] and in Molly Young, the seventeen year old daughter of a villager.

That the parents might not feel this to be a charity school, Owen charged 3p. a month or 3s. yearly for the older day school children but nothing for the infant and evening schools. This

---

[69]Owen disapproved of early use of books,—"Books are worse than useless in infant schools," *Autob.*, p. 175, and "when the best means of instruction or of forming character are known, I doubt whether books will be ever used before the children attain their tenth year." *Ibid.*, p. 240. This was a Rousseau idea.

[70]Griscom, *A Year in Europe*, vol. ii, p. 250.

[71]*Report of the Deputation of Leeds, Autob.*, App. R, p. 254.

[72]An amusing story is told of Buchanan's later career. He was so successful in the infant school of New Lanark that when Lord Brougham, Henry Hase and others decided to found another such school in London, they asked Owen if he would release Buchanan to take charge of it. He agreed and after Buchanan had been in charge at the Westminster school for some little time Owen went down to see it, where, "I was horrified to see Mrs. Buchanan whom I had never seen in the New Lanark school brandishing a whip over the children while Buchanan stayed in another part of the room, apparently as much subject to his wife as the children." *Autob.*, p. 152.

did not begin to cover the expense of the school, the actual cost being about 700 pounds more each year than the amount taken in.[73]

The fame of the school brought about 2,000 visitors yearly[74] including men of the highest rank in every type of human activity and interest. Among them were the Grand Duke Nicholas of Russia, afterwards Emperor, the Duke of Holstein-Oldenburgh, Princes John and Maximilian, of Austria, foreign ambassadors, many bishops, members of the clergy, "all" the English nobility, learned men of all professions from all countries, wealthy travellers, etc.[75] This was an intoxicating draught for almost any son of man and proved quite overpowering for a "self made" cotton manufacturer who had known no systematic education after the age of eight.

The Dukes of Kent and Sussex (afterwards father and uncle of Victoria) had become interested in Owen's views through his writings and had visited him in London. In order to secure some first hand knowledge of New Lanark, the Duke of Kent sent his private physician, Dr. McNab, to investigate. From the description of his findings and his interview with a member of the Leeds deputation[76] whom he sought, Dr. McNab gives a very clear picture of the community and the school.[77] He may be over enthusiastic but that arouses no wonder when one considers prevalent conditions existing in the usual factory populations

---

[73] *Autobiography,* p. 135.

[74] *Autob.,* p. 145. I have seen as many as 70 strangers attending the opening exercises in the morning.

[75] *Ibid.*

[76] In 1819 the town of Leeds sent a deputation consisting of Edward Baines, the editor of the Leeds *Mercury,* a Dissenter,—Robert Oastler, a Wesleyan and John Cawood, an Anglican, to see New Lanark, and to report upon it, since they (in Leeds) were considering the adoption of certain of Owen's plans in order to meet the extreme poverty which was alarming all England. Their report, much of which is quoted here, is given in *Life of Owen,* App. R. p. 253.

[77] Henry Grey McNab, M.D., *The New Views of Mr. Owen, of Lanark,* London, 1819.

of the day. "There exist," he says, "among the inhabitants of New Lanark young and old, more of the social virtues and less of the reigning vices than will be found in any community of the same population in any part of the civilized world." [78] And in substantiation of his own opinion he quotes from a letter of a Parliament member who says,[79] "I do not hesitate to declare that I never saw any population so moral, so religious, well-behaved and happy as that in the peaceful vale of Owen's mill. The happiness of the children is distinctly expressed in their countenances."

The village was very attractive for a mill town, the building[80] for the school for character in the center, the houses of the inhabitants arranged with regularity around. To each house belonged a garden space, while seven or eight acres were laid out as a kitchen garden for the entire community. This large garden was surrounded by a belt of "planting" and by a spacious walk where the villagers strolled and where they enjoyed a view of the country for two miles around. The village had its own store where the best of all necessities could be bought at cost[81] and the comfort and happiness of its citizens seem to have struck every visitor who has left a record of his visit. Each worker in the community contributed one sixtieth of his income for an illness and old age pension fund,[82] and there was a savings bank for the working people which at Christmas 1818, contained deposits amounting to 3,193 pounds, 14 shillings and 10d, and this in a territory numbering 2,300 of whom 500 were under ten.[83] In ten years there were only twenty-eight illegitimate births to 1,380 women, less than three a year, a rate far below that of Great

---

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[79] "Letter of John Smith," M. P., of Nov. 1818. McNab, p. 50.

[80] McNab, *New Views*, p. 68, et sq.

[81] One of the Leeds party had met a woman carrying a round of beef which she had said would have cost her 10d. a pound in Glasgow, but which she had bought for 7d. at the store. McNab, *New Views*, p. 109.

[82] This is the same idea which the 20th century advocates as compulsory insurance.

[83] *Report of Leeds Deputation, Autob.*, App. R. p. 256.

Britain. The Leeds deputy told Dr. McNab that as their party[84] entered New Lanark they met an old man, who said he had come to the village with only sixpence in his pocket twenty-five years before. He was then the scavenger general of the village, and had given his son, who was preparing to enter the church and who was received socially by families of standing, a university education, had educated his daughter who was then a mantua maker, very thoroughly, and himself had money in the bank.[85]

The building for the formation of character was three stories in height, 145 feet long and 45 feet wide. The lower story was given up to kitchens, a bake shop, store rooms and the apartments of the superintendent.[86] The second floor was divided into three rooms, one of which was used in bad weather for the infant school and the other two as school rooms for the older children (5 to 10) the boys and girls being taught in separate classes except in singing, dancing and in the lectures.[87] The third story had two rooms, one, 90 by 40 feet, with a gallery and pulpit, used as a lecture room, the other 49 by 40 with walls hung with pictures of animals, minerals, etc., a room used for dancing and singing lessons.

The Leeds deputy gives a vivid description[88] of his visit, "We went first to the school for children from 2 to 4 years of age, and a more pleasing sight is not to be found from Johnny Groat's house to Land's End. The glow of health, of innocent pleasure and unabashed freedom mantled their pretty countenances. From there we entered the upper school, a school for cleanliness, utility and neatness, I should not suppose surpassed in the Kingdom: they were commencing the day by singing a psalm,

---

[84]In this party was Sir Wm. de Crespigny who afterwards (1819) sought to have Owen's plan for the manufacturing and laboring poor investigated by a committee of the House and in that debate (*Hansard,* lxi, c. 1189), said that "he had seen the effects of education in New Lanark and would never forget it to his dying day."

[85]McNab, *New Views,* p. 103.

[86]McNab, *New Views,* etc., p. 68.

[87]R. D. Owen, *Outline of the System,* etc., p. 30.

[88]McNab, *New Views,* etc., quotes this almost in full, p. 98, et sqq.

then the master prayed and afterwards read a chapter in the New Testament. . . . The next visit was to the large room for marching, dancing, etc. Six boys in Highland caps and plaids[89] entered playing a quick march on the fife until all the boys and girls had entered. After marching in review, certain ones, about fifty in number, formed two lines in the center of a square, where to the accompaniment of a clarionet they sang[90] 'The Birks of Aberfeldy,' 'Banks and Braes,' 'Auld Lang Syne,' etc. They were followed by a group, who barefoot, but with grace in their steps, gave two or three dances."

"Next we entered the large school which will hold an audience of 1,200. Here were girls and boys from 4 to 12 years of age employed in sewing, marking, reading, writing, accounts, etc. We heard the children of four read very well in the New Testament, others of five from historical pieces. The writers and counters were industrious and the ladies who were with us said that the sewing and marking were very well done."

"From there we went to the gallery where we stood to watch a professional man from Edinburgh[91] teaching four barefooted boys and girls the different steps and curtseys, and graceful bows. It was delightful to see these rustic sons and daughters, with perfect ease, making the obeisant compliment or tripping on the light, fantastic toe."

---

[89]When Owen and his Quaker partner Allen, seriously disagreed about the management of the school, one of the resolutions insisted upon by Mr. Allen was that "having considered the dress of the children we are of the opinion that decency requires that all males wear trousers or drawers as they arrive at the age of six years; we agree therefore that they shall be required to be so clothed." *New Existence,* Part v, p. 8. Robert Dale Owen describes the dress of the children as, "made of strong white cotton cloth in the shape of a Roman tunic and changed three times a week." *Outline of the System,* etc., p. 33. Let us hope that for the sake of "decency" the white costume was resumed!

[90]Griscom mentions evidently with decided enjoyment, that the song the children were singing as he entered "was a love song instead of a hymn." *A Year in Europe,* vol. ii, p. 250.

[91]Griscom reports the dancing master of his visit, (*A Year in Europe,* vol. 2, p. 251), as the village glazier and painter.

In the evening the building was opened to the older people who might wish to congregate and to the children over ten years of age who, their mill day over, might wish to learn lessons, singing and dancing. For industrial training, there were iron and brass foundries, smith's and iron turning shops, smiths' hearths and lathes and a machine maker's shop containing about 30 hands,[92] where children over twelve years were taught these trades if their parents so desired.

The school curriculum[93] contained the usual subjects of the period; reading, for which they had great difficulty in finding desirable books, writing (current hand writing without lines), the usual system of arithmetic taught in Scotland with the later addition of mental arithmetic after Pestalozzi, and history and geography which seem to have aroused the greatest interest. The geography was quite entertaining,—"they were instructed in classes on the maps of the four quarters of the globe, where were delineated the usual divisions of the best maps, but there were no names of cities or countries or towns, but for cities and towns there were small and distinct circles to denote their location. A light wand long enough for the smallest child to reach the top of the map was provided and one of the children would ask another child to point to certain places. As long as the child could answer the questions put to him he retained his place but when he failed to answer, he had to resign the wand to his questioner. The lookers on were as much amused as the children themselves."[94]

The history was more complicated and was worked out on a series of maps of the "Streams of Time"; each century "closed with a line drawn across" and the younger Owen believed that by "these means the children are able to point out the chief historical events as they do the countries on the map of the world, count the years as they do degrees of latitude and longitude, and acquire almost as clear an understanding (?) of the history of the world

---

[92] *Autob.*, p. 136.
[93] R. D. Owen, *Outline of System at New Lanark*, 1824, p. 36, et sqq.
[94] *Autob.*, p. 144.

as that which the first terrestrial globe gave them of its form and divisions."[95]

Natural History was taught by means of the domestic animals and natural objects with which the children were surrounded. In commenting on the workings of the school, R. D. Owen declares "that to a stranger, the general appearance of the children is very striking. The leading character of their faces is a look of mingled openness, confidence and intelligence such as is scarcely to be met with among children in their situation. Their animal spirits are good, their manner and deportment toward their teachers and toward strangers are fearless and unrestrained, yet neither forward nor disrespectful. Their health is excellent, —the surgeon examining the children periodically.[96] The individual literary acquirements of the greater proportion of the older classes are such as perhaps no body of children of the same age in any situation have had the opportunity for attaining. Sufficient degree of friendly emulation is excited without any artificial stimulus but it is an emulation which induces them to prefer going forward with their companions to leaving them behind." And it has been found that those children who made the greatest proficiency in their various studies, proved the best, most industrious and most intelligent of assistants, both as work people and domestics. According to one visitor, "the children and youth in this delightful colony are superior in point of conduct and character to all children and youth I have ever seen."[97]

The entire absence of religious teaching at New Lanark aroused much criticism. In the village was a minister paid by the manufacturers to preach in Gaelic,[98] and when Griscom visited the colony he spoke of four religious denominations as established there, the Methodists, the Gaelic, the National kirk, and the Independents.[99] But Owen refused to countenance the teach-

---

[95]R. Dale Owen, *Outline of System,* etc., p. 50.
[96]Evidently *not* a 20th century idea!
[97]McNab, *New Views,* p. 136.
[98]*Report of Leeds Deputy,* quoted by McNab, p. 115.
[99]Griscom, *A Year in Europe,* Vol. 2, p. 254.

ing of any religious creed,—"my own conviction is that the only true religion is truth or knowledge in accordance with all facts and with reason, on subjects relative to human nature and to society. To give a rational education to man then, he must not be taught any of the existing religions to prejudice the mind in its favor. His mind should be kept perfectly free until it shall be previously trained in a knowledge of undisputed facts relative to his own nature and to human society. This he may be educated to acquire at the age of twelve or fourteen, when the foundations, principles and dogmas of all the past and present religions of the world should be impartially explained.[100] He should have time allowed to compare all these religions and to reflect upon what has been said and written for and against each and then to contrast them with undisputed facts respecting human nature and society. This is the first step to be taken before your children can be educated rationally."[101]

His son in defence of his father's attitude asks pertinently, —"Would a chemist anxious that a child should be able to trace and understand some valuable and important deductions which with great study and investigation he had derived from certain chemical facts, act wisely in insisting that the child should at once commit to memory and believe implicitly those deductions? Would he act consistently in objecting to a system that would first teach the pupil the elements of chemistry, should gradually store his mind with chemical facts and at length when his judgment had become matured, place before him those important deductions and allow him to judge for himself as to their accuracy?"[102]

Such an experiment as the New Lanark school can not be judged fairly without due consideration of the existing disadvantages and difficulties. The children were with their parents all but eight hours of the day and no teaching rational or otherwise could offset the parental influence in manners and habit. Then it was extremely difficult to secure teachers who had both

[100] This sounds strangely like *"Emile"!*

[101] *Mr. Owen's System*, p. 4.

[102] R. Dale Owen, *Outline of System*, etc., p. 55.

training and natural endowment to carry out Owen's ideas. The parents also eager for the added income, usually sent their children to the factory at the age of ten, thus breaking off their education at a most important period. But despite these drawbacks, the school at New Lanark gave effective proof of the possibilities of the so-termed factory children, of the *wisdom* of education for the masses. In a letter from Huxley at the time of the centenary anniversary of Owen's birth, his belief in the importance of Owen's work in the field of education is evinced: "I think that every one who is compelled to look closely into the problem of popular education, must be led to Owen's conclusion, that the infant school is, so to speak, the key of the situation: and that Robert Owen discovered this great fact and had the courage and patience to work out his theory into a practical reality, is his claim, if he had no other, to the enduring gratitude of the people."[103]

But other developments than New Lanark and the Factory Bill were engrossing Owen's attention in the years of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. During the Napoleonic war England had prospered. The tremendous demand for goods of all kinds had boomed both commerce and manufactures. But now the war was over and the market was glutted with products for which there was no demand, wages had fallen, and the country swarmed with the unemployed. This unemployment was not due alone to the great drop in demand for labor after the war, but also to the inventions which had so largely superseded the hand workers and so tremendously enlarged the possible output. As Owen's report explained "in one establishment (New Lanark of course) which contains only 2,500 people the output is as great as that produced by the entire population of Scotland fifty years ago, while the output of the United Kingdom equals that formerly produced by the work of 8,000,000 of people."[104] Ignorance, poverty and crime, the adjuncts of war, abounded. There

[103] *Report of the Festival Commemorating the Centenary of the Birth of Robert Owen*, 1871. *Letter* from Huxley dated April 21, 1871, in preface.

[104] *Report to the Committee of the Association for the Relief of the Manufacturing and Laboring Poor,* referred to the Committee of the House of Commons on the Poor Laws, March, 1817, *Autob.,* App. I. p. 54.

was every evidence of alarm among the ruling classes,—the memory of events across the channel was very fresh in mind. The poor rates were increasing with great rapidity and Parliament felt the need of some type of mitigating action. Because of his success at New Lanark[105] Owen was asked by men of prominence to express his views concerning the conditions and to formulate a plan which he believed practicable as a means by which the situation might be improved. He proposed "to find advantageous occupation for the poor and unemployed to whose labor mechanism must be made subservient instead of being permitted as at present, to supersede it."[106] This he believed to be possible by means of a plan which he laid before the people,[107]—a plan which gave rise to the Cooperative Community. Briefly summarized, he wished[108] to make the poor "national" by affording them "national education and employment which alone can create a permanent, rational, intelligent, wealthy and superior population," [109] and this was to be accomplished by gathering them (voluntarily) into villages of from 500 to 1,200 inhabitants. Each district or county was to mortgage its poor rates[110] to the amount of their value for a number of years and with that money buy land and erect buildings which would remain as capital. The labor of the members of the community, each of whom was to have the use of an acre of

---

[105] *Hansard*, lxi, c. 1216.

[106] *Autob.*, App. I, c. 54.

[107] *Report to the Committee of the Association for the Relief of, etc., and Subsequent Public Proceedings in London*, July, August and September, 1817.

[108] No attempt is made to discuss the economic soundness or the fallacies of Owen's plan.

[109] *Autob.*, p. 129.

[110] Owen's views on the Poor rates are worth citation: "The immense sums continually raised for the poor are lavished in utter disregard of every principle of public justice or economy. They offer greater rewards for idleness and vice than for industry and virtue,—and thus directly operate to increase the degradation and the misery of the classes they are designed to serve. No sum however enormous, administrated after this manner could be productive of any other result: rather will pauperism and wretchedness increase along with the increase of an expenditure thus applied." *Autob.*, App. I, p. 61, et sq. At this time many parishes listed more than half their inhabitants on the poor rates.

ground as well as all other community privileges, would render the establishment self supporting. If the county did not wish to raise the money, by that means, it could be raised by private subscription or better still from the central government. Besides the garden supplies raised by "spade" cultivation, the community was to have its own factory-produced supplies and all necessities of every kind.

Tremendous interest was aroused. A Scotchman offered 1,500 acres to try the plan out and contributions for the purpose began to come in. It was the time of Owen's greatest popularity. The *Times* of August 9, 1817, remarked, "Mr. Owen's communication occupies so large a space in our columns today that we can do no more than claim for them that attention to which his enlightened zeal in the cause of humanity must at all times entitle the author." The tone was very different in less than a fortnight.

With an enthusiasm, an earnestness pathetic in the extreme, Owen called a public meeting at a London tavern where he explained with great solemnity, dignity and intense feeling that the difficulties of life were due largely to the entire falsity of the basic principle of all religions,—the principle of man's moral responsibility. He seems to have believed that in that moment he had slain the religious faith of the world,—"that day, was ever to be remembered in the annals of history—bigotry and superstition and all false religions received their death blow." [111]

The immediate effect was partial ostracism,[112]—he had injured not only the church but the class consciousness[113] of all

[111] *Autob.*, pp. 160-162. Mr. Owen never seems to have possessed so much as a ray of humor and its absence transforms this melodramatic scene from one of absurdity to one of pathos.

[112] Official persecutions for less offenses were not uncommon, and the next day when Mr. Brougham met Owen on the street, he said, "how the devil could you say what you did yesterday at your public meeting? If any of us had said half so much, we should have been burned alive and here you are quietly walking as if nothing had happened." *Autob.*, p. 162.

[113] The tone of the *Times* had changed, "The curtain dropt yesterday upon Mr. Owen's drama, not soon, it is probable, to rise again. Mr. Owen promised a Paradise to mankind, but as far as we can understand, not such a Paradise as a sane mind would enjoy, or a disciple of Christianity could meditate without terror." August 22, 1817.

classes except the laboring class and an ultra-conservative people fearful of change and mindful of the "Reign of Reason" in its neighborhood, could not easily overlook the challenge of his ideas. Whether or not they would have passed over his theological defects had his practical plans been without economic flaw, it is impossible to say, but it seems quite probable that the very extremity of his expressions diminished their influence, and that the failure of his plans was due to economic reasons rather than ecclesiastical opposition.

Into the story of the development of his plan for the poor, it is not the province of this paper to enter far. The Duke of Kent himself, always interested in Owen's ideas,[114] presided at a meeting held in 1819 to consider Owen's plan and this meeting recommended its trial.[115] An attempt was made after this meeting to secure a committee from the House,[116] which should investigate the scheme, but that was tabled with a vote of 141 nays to 16 ayes. Owen himself said that the church had greatly interfered with the carrying out of his plan by preventing as far as possible, the publication of his writings.[117] The death of the Duke of Kent seems to have retarded (1820) the scheme which he was about ready to engineer, and it was some time before the scheme was tried out, either on the original or on a modified plan. There is not place here for the discussion of these attempts, what they proved in failure or in success.[118] Owen's thoughts and attention were more and more diverted from New Lanark. His plans were

---

[114]Letters of the Duke of Kent to Owen, *Rational Quarterly and Review,* pp. 27-30.

[115]*The Black Dwarf,* (a Radical publication of the day) (1817) Vol. I, p. 475. (T. J. Wooler) attacked him more than once, "Mr. Owen is pursuing a dangerous game. He dictates in politics, in morals and in speculations with equal authority and the result of all his deductions amounts only to, 'I am I, and I am right,' You are you, and you are wrong. I shall not answer your arguments. They are futile and ignorant. Read my papers and be convinced."

[116]*Hansard,* lxi, c. 1189.

[117]*Autob.,* p. 200.

[118]Motherwell, *Orbiston* (see *Cooperative Magazine,* vol. i, p. 162), 1825. New Harmony, Indiana (*New Harmony Gazette*), 1825.

much in the public eye[119] and widely discussed. He was abroad for a while on the continent and was received with much cordiality and enthusiasm, and in 1822 he went to Ireland, where he was warmly welcomed, to investigate the causes and possible cures of conditions existing there. On his return he left very soon (in 1824) for the United States, remaining there for over a year and beginning his connection with New Harmony, Indiana.

The relations between Owen and his Quaker partners had been strained for some years,[120] due to their disapproval of certain phases of his management (including dancing, singing, etc.), but his reasons for leaving New Lanark, beyond this fact and his faith in the possibilities of the new world as a stage to prove his theories, seem a trifle obscure. He severed connections with New Lanark in 1828 and, in writing of that time, said,[121] "I had accomplished for this population as much as such a manufacturing system as this would admit of; and although the poor work people were content and by contrast with other manufacturing establishments and all other workpeople under this old system, deemed themselves so much better treated and cared for, and were highly satisfied; yet I know it was a miserable existence compared with that which, with the immense means at the control of all governments, might be created for every population over the world." "And, after all, what had I done for these people? What was their real condition even with all the expenditure that had been incurred and the measures which had

---

[119]*Gentleman's Magazine*, September, 1817, p. 197, "Ecclesiasticus," "No thing founded by a scion of that rank weed planted by Arius and Socinus and watered by Bolingbroke, Voltaire, and Tom Paine, should be fostered or encouraged under any mistaken notion respecting its nature or qualities." *Ibid.*, February, 1818, p. 324. "Christianus" quotes the biography of Plutarch as applicable to Owen, "He appears to have examined every system with a calm and unprejudiced attention, to have selected what he found of use for the purpose of virtue and happiness and to have left the rest for the portion of those whose narrowness of mind could think either science or felicity confined to any denomination of men." Also, *Ibid.*, January, 1818-1819; July, 1821; June, 1822; August, 1823 and 1824.

[120]*Autob.*, p. 235.

[121]Owen, *Revolution in Mind and Practice*, p. 21.

been adopted to improve it? The people were slaves at my mercy,—liable at any time to be dismissed and knowing that in that case they must go into misery compared with such limited happiness as they now enjoyed."

It is only just, lest the diversity of the interests[122] of his later years and his intemperate zeal in promoting his belief in "the great discovery of the Age and the death blow of bigotry," divert attention from his early achievements, to summarize once more those accomplishments in the light of that which was directly performed and without the additional consideration of the tremendous influence in the morale of his example: (a) He completely changed[123] the physical, mental, and moral complexion of a community of twenty-five hundred people, (b) he effected a moral change[124] so complete that in thirty years no application had to be made to lawyer or magistrate for legal punishment, (c) the entire population was happy and satisfied and made its satisfaction public (App. of *Autob.* T., p. 321,—W, p. 329,—Z, p. 335), (d) education was provided for the children at a cost of twelve hundred pounds annually, more than the amount received from the parents, (e) the work hours for all ages were reduced in 1816 to ten and one half hours, (f) the whole population was supplied with the best of necessities at cost, (g) full wages (over seven thousand pounds) were paid to the mill workers during the four months' embargo of the United States,

[122]R. Dale Owen, *Threading My Way*, p. 191. "Owen had been misled by prosperity and by benevolent enthusiasm and there had been lacking as steadying influence culture in his youth. He had risen with rare rapidity and by unaided exertion to a dizzy height,—then, too, his popularity among the masses quite equalled the favor with which men of talent and rank received him. Is it a matter of marvel that a self-made and self-taught man should have miscalculated his social methods and overestimated the influence of the position he had gained?"

[123]It is interesting to note that during the years when this was being done for the people of New Lanark (30 years) the proprietors netted over 300,000 pounds in profit. *Rational Quarterly and Review*, p. 33.

[124]Owen declared the following to be the individual rights of mankind: to be well born, well and rationally fed, well lodged, well trained, well educated, well employed, well recreated, and well governed. *Reporters' Report of the Meetings in 1858*, pp. 18-24.

and (h) more than all else, the foundation for remedial and protective factory legislation was laid by Robert Owen.

Owen's early work, based on a religion of all-embracing charity and devotion to truth, has surely been justified in the slow process of social development. A man, remarkable for his mechanical and administrative understanding, yet unable to reason,—driven by his faith in the possibilities of humanity, devoted in his personal energy to the promotion of all that promised a greater good to the masses, but never able to go deeply into the foundation of his theories of good, he presents contradictory elements whose warring significance complicates the process of reaching a just estimate. No one, however, can fail to admire unreservedly the great singlemindedness of purpose which led to the sacrifice of wealth, popularity, and friends, that he might prove to all the world the innate goodness of man and the natural perfection of a Universe created by a just God.

To us of to-day, however, facing the problems of intense, unregulated competitive industry, and eager to see the path open toward economic justice, the chief satisfaction in the work of Owen lies in the knowledge that "the real results of his work are to be seen in the long series of factory legislation which slowly and imperfectly, it is true, has yet built up a system of protection for the workers,—and in the efforts which in the twentieth century have at least achieved some beginnings of success for international regulation of labor." [125]

2. The Sources of the Principles which Expressed Themselves in the New Lanark Institution

The inspiration of Owen's efforts at New Lanark was to be found in two sources, his belief in a supreme power in the Universe and in the perfectibility of human nature. He was a Deist, an agnostic, between whom and an infidel little distinction was made (or is yet made). "Man, the chief of these terrestrial existences," he says, "has been formed by a Power unknown and

[125] B. L. Hutchins, *Fabian Tract*, 166, p. 22.

mysterious to him; that Power he has called by some name in all languages which signifies the Power that eternally acts through the Universe, but which no man has yet been able to comprehend. In our language this universal Power is called God." [126]

While Owen reaps and deserves the credit for the success of the social efforts made at New Lanark, it must be remembered that at the time when his partners were forcing him out of the mills because they believed that the factories should exist wholly for commercial purposes and that he was wasting money and time in attempting to make the lives of the employees healthier, happier, and richer, those who came to his relief and backed him with their money (the supreme test of faith) were three Quakers —John Walker, Joseph Foster, and William Allen; a Dissenter, Joseph Fox; an Anglican, afterwards Lord Mayor, Michael Gibbs; and Jeremy Bentham.

While Owen was known as an excellent business man, and it may be suggested that the motives of these men who joined him were not entirely disinterested, definite proof exists of the feeling that moved the Quakers at least, "the consideration of entering into the New Lanark concern has occupied much of my attention this week and we are very anxious that Owen should be one of the purchasers in order that his noble plans for ameliorating the condition of the laboring and manufacturing poor may be maintained." [127]

---

[126] *Public Discussion between Robert Owen and J. H. Roebuck,* Manchester, 1837, p. 7.

[127] Extract from the Journal of Wm. Allen in *Life of Wm. Allen,* vol. i, p. 181, London, 1846.

V

THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN AND GIRLS FROM LABOR IN THE MINES AND COLLIERIES OF THE BRITISH ISLES, AND RESTRICTIONS IN THE EMPLOYMENT OF BOYS

1. The Process of Securing Prohibitive Legislation

Legislation for the protection of the weak and weaponless, has occasionally been secured with a minimum of active opposition. Those occasions, however, rarely signify the existence of a universally humanitarian sentiment, or of a recognized principle of democracy. They express, rather, popular acknowledgment of conditions so black that when once the public eye has observed them, no proprietor, no conservative, no *laissez faire* enthusiast however plausible, can whiten them sufficiently to disguise the truth, to divert public attention or to modify or reverse public opinion. Common, elemental decency demands reform.

Such were the conditions upon which Lord Ashley focussed public attention when he demanded that the labor of women and girls in the mines and collieries of the British Isles should cease for all time.

In August, 1840, in an address which he made in the Commons concerning the employment of children, Lord Ashley turned the attention of the members for the first time to the child and women laborers of the mines. To do this he was forced to abandon, for a brief while, his untiring efforts to free the little factory workers, and the fact that he was willing to do so is the strongest evidence of the terrible conditions which prevailed in the labor below the earth's surface. Fortunately for the cause of the factory children, the official stamp of public disapproval, was affixed to mining conditions in a short time and their unwearying champion was soon free to return to the cause which he led for a quarter of a century.

In his initial address[1] before the Commons, on the subject

[1] *Hansard* 3rd S. lv, c. 1265.

of the mines, Lord Ashley quoted at some length from the report of a Commissioner on the employment of children made in 1833. The report was that of a Mr. Tuffnell and showed conditions so wretched that one wonders at the nine years which had elapsed before the matter received serious consideration. He described the hard labor in the regular nine-hour day which sometimes became a twelve or even a thirteen-hour day. Sometimes the workers stopped for two or three minutes to eat, sometimes had no food at all, and sometimes ate and worked at the same time. Some of the children, who were numerous in the mines, were under six years of age. "The mines are dusty, damp, and full of bad air; sometimes as hot as an oven; sometimes so hot as to melt a candle. A vast many girls in the pits go down just the same as the boys, by ladders or baskets; the girls wear breeches and are beaten the same as the boys; many bastards are produced in the pits; much fighting goes on amongst the workers. There is much crookedness among them, caused by the labor; they are exposed to terrible accidents; they work in very contracted spaces. The children frequently are plagued by sore feet and gatherings. I cannot but think (says one witness) that many nights they cannot get sleep with a whole skin, for their backs get cut and bruised with knocking against the mine, it is so low. It is wet under foot; the water oftentimes runs down from the roof; many lives are lost in various ways and many severely injured by burning; the workers are knocked up after fifty. I cannot much err in coming to the conclusion, both from what I saw and the evidences of witnesses given on oath above, that it must appear to every impartial judge of the occupations that the hardest labor in the worst room, in the worst conducted factory, is less hard, less cruel, and less demoralizing than the labor in the best of coal mines."

These were the conditions existing in 1833 and Lord Ashley, in quoting them, ended his speech (1840) with a motion[2] that an address be presented to the Queen requesting that an inquiry

[2] *Hansard* 3rd S. lv, c. 1274.

be made into the employment of the children of the poorer classes in mines and collieries. His motion for the appointment of a Commission was seconded[3] by Mr. Brotherton and the Commons seemed practically unanimous in the feeling that the situation should be immediately investigated and legislation adopted, if conditions were in any way comparable to those pictured in the report of 1833.

Not only was deep and vigorous sympathy expressed by Fox Maule, Hume, and others for Lord Ashley's motion, but one of the members affirmed[4] that not only should this immediate matter receive prompt and remedial attention, but that it should be remembered that back of the problem of child employment lay that curse of extreme poverty which itself should be dealt with as a larger and more inclusive problem. There was a tacit understanding that a move was to be made to remove women and girls from labor in the mines.

While the investigating Commission was engaged in its work there appeared, from sources where it might be expected, petitions to prevent the passage of the proposed bill. The Guardians of the Poor in certain districts, foreseeing a larger poor rate necessary until those displaced should find other work to provide self-support, opposed any such legislation.[5]

In the Lords, the natural stronghold of Conservatism, the Duke of Hamilton presented[6] petitions from the women employed in mines and collieries of Stirlingshire against the passage of the bill. "The poor females in collieries did not desire to be relieved of their labor. It was sweet to them because by it they were enabled to maintain themselves or perhaps a parent, or a child, or perhaps all three. Deprive them of that labor and they were made miserable as well as those dependent upon them. On all these grounds he thought the bill most unjust in its principle and most ruinous to those poor persons in its consequences."

---

[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Hansard* 3rd S. lv, c. 1274.
[5] *Ibid.*, lxiii, c. 166.
[6] *Ibid.*, 316.

The Bishop of Norwich presented[7] petitions from Oldham, from Chester, Pendleton, Leeds, and Lancaster praying for some measure to prevent employment of women in mines and to investigate the conditions of the children's labor. Earl Fitzwilliam, however, wished[8] the Lords to understand that the "women and girls did not work in chains but merely drew wagons loaded with coal by chains attached to the wagons and to belts which they wore around their waists. They were forced to move on all fours." The Lords, even, do not seem to have shared the Earl's enthusiasm for the "limitations" in the use of chains, but listened with some interest to his arguments—arguments which were always intended to raise obstacles and secure delay—that the children were worse off in agriculture and in factories and that those conditions should be remedied before the matter of mines was taken up.

The reports from the Commission began to appear. The picture they drew horrified even those quite accustomed to the stories of factory conditions and varied types of industrial abuse of children. They affirmed[9] that children sometimes began work in the mines at the age of four years, that there were many workers as young as six, and very many eight and nine years of age. One case was recorded[10] where the child had been taken regularly to the pit at the age of three, when all he could do was to hold the candle for his father.

At Oldham the usual age for the entrance of boys into mining labor was seven to nine years. But in the mountain mines or smaller collieries in the hills, where the coal strata were very thin, varying in thickness from eighteen inches to two feet, they were taken to the mines as early as four years of age, "some so young that they are often taken in their bedgowns." [11]

---

[7] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxiii, 196.

[8] *Ibid.*, c. 196.

[9] *Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children in Mines*, 1842, vol. xv, p. 9.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

The work of these babies was usually that of "trappers." They sat beside the traps or doors in the coal seams through which the coal carts were passed to the roads leading to the main road where the coal was placed to be removed to the surface. It was dangerous to leave a door open as it caused great heat, closeness, and a possible explosion. These babies, then, sat in a spot hollowed out in the wall and when they heard the approach of a coal cart pulled open the trap by means of a cord and closed it after the cart had passed. They worked for twelve and fourteen hours daily with no light except what some kindly disposed miner was willing to give them in the shape of candle ends. The places were usually damp and no matter how monotonous the labor, the strap was applied if they delayed or endangered the work by falling asleep. They never saw sunlight except upon Sunday, and had no relaxation whatsoever except upon that day. Hodder, the biographer of Lord Ashley who uncovered the situation, says[12] that instances were known where highly sensitive children became imbeciles from the fright of darkness, loneliness, and the vermin with which the mines were frequently infested. The seams were sometimes only twenty-two to twenty-eight inches high and only tiny children could pass through at all.

In Scotland conditions were even worse than in England. As children grew older they became "hurryers" (those who dragged the baskets or carts from the seam to the main road and back), "fillers" (those who filled the carts or corves, which were large baskets), "riddlers," "tippers," etc. The "hurryers" dragged the cart or corve (basket) filled with coal by a chain fastened to the cart and to a belt or girdle fastened around the waist. They moved on all fours, the chain passing between the legs. Women and girls were found doing this work, their only clothing being ragged breeches, and their sides blistered and raw from the girdle.

In one mine in Scotland[13] little girls began at the age of six

---

[12]Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, vol. i, p. 413.

[13]*Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children in Mines*, 1842, vol. xv, p. 18.

to drag these carts and their testimony is enough to make the hardest and most indifferent wince. Little Margaret Leveston, aged six, testified[14] that "she carries full fifty-six pounds of coal in a wooden backit. The work is na guid, it is so very sair."

Many proprietors, so the Commissioners declared,[15] were entirely indifferent to the age at which children were employed, saying that parents were the best judges at which children should begin work,—but some few would not employ young children. A little chap of seven said,[16] "I been down in the mines about three years. When I first went down I could not keep awake. I don't fall asleep now. I smokes my pipe." (He had a miner's lamp and a pipe stuck in his buttonhole, as the miners carried them.) "There was something grotesque and revolting," said[17] the Commissioners, "about the workmanlike manner of the pigmy colliers."

Girls as well as boys, clad only in breeches, performed all the same kinds of labor. One girl of fourteen was found half lying in a passage two feet high and half sitting. She found her work very hard, she said, and "of course did not like it."

One little "trapper," aged seven, testified,[17] "I stand and open and shut the door. I'm generally in the dark and sit me down against the door. I stop twelve hours in the pit and never see daylight now except on Sundays. I have to trap without a light and I'm scared. I go at four and sometimes half-past three in the morning and come out at five or half-past. I never go to sleep. Sometimes I sing when I've light, but not in the dark. I dare not sing then. I don't like it in the pit. I'm very sleepy when I go sometimes in the morning."

At Brampton[18] the coal seams were so thin that all the mining was done by boys ten to thirteen, lying on their sides and holing out the coal in that position, while younger lads, eight

[14] *Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children in Mines*, 1842, vol. xv, p. 18.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

to twelve, loaded it in the barrow and dragged it to the bank by the dog chain and belt. The passages through which they had to move were very often covered two to three inches with black mud. In certain pits the children had to drag barrows with a hundredweight of coal or slack sixty times a day, sixty yards, and bring the empty barrows back without once straightening their backs unless they chose to stand under the shafts at the risk of being crushed with a sudden loosening of coal and propping timbers.

One of the worst features in the labor of the women and girls was the fact that the men usually worked entirely naked, and as each miner had a section at some distance from every other miner, and worked it alone with the assistance of his feminine "hurrier," the moral conditions were unspeakable.[19] Women performed all the work of mining except the actual digging out of the coal with the picks; they dragged the carts by chains, they filled them, they carried coal in baskets on their backs, they labored when just about to become mothers. One woman told[20] that she had had four children,—two born dead and the other two died immediately after birth. Another[21] that she had borne eight children of whom four were born dead.

The reason for the use of women so extensively, as drawers in the pits, was that a girl of twenty worked for two shillings a day or less, while a man of that age demanded three shillings. One witness[22] remarks that "it makes little difference to the coal master; he pays the same whoever does the work; some would say he got his coal cheaper, but I am not of that opinion. The only difference is that the collier (who received a certain amount and paid his assistants out of it) can spend one shilling to one shilling sixpence more at the ale house, and very often the woman who helps him get it helps him spend it."

The married women, who went back to work usually within

---

[19] *Report of the Commissioners,* etc., 1842, vol. xv, pp. 24 and 31-37.
[20] *Ibid.,* p. 27.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] *Ibid.,* pp. 26-27.

a week after the birth of a child, had to employ someone to look after their children who were yet too young to enter the pits, and the consequent neglect and resultant infant and child mortality can be readily imagined.[23]

"The workings in the narrow seams are sometimes one hundred to two hundred yards from the main roads," explained the Commissioners, "so that the females have to crawl backwards and forwards with their small carts in seams little more than twenty-two to twenty-eight inches in height. The danger and difficulty in dragging on roads dipping from one foot in three to one foot in six, may be imagined more easily than it can be explained; and the state that the females are in after pulling like horses through these holes,—their perspiration, exhaustion, and frequent tears, it is painful in the extreme even to witness. Yet, when the work is done, they return to it with a vigor that is astonishing, considering how they hate it. The business of these females is to remove the coals from the hewer who has picked them from the wall face, and placing them either on their backs as they do when working in edge seams or in little carts when on levels, to carry them to the main road. Now, when the nature of this horrible labor is taken into consideration, its extreme severity, its regular duration of from twelve to fourteen hours daily, the damp, heated, and unwholesome atmosphere of a coal mine and the tender age and sex of the workers,—a picture is presented of deadly physical oppression and systematic slavery of which I conscientiously believe no one unacquainted with the facts would credit the existence in the British Dominions." [24]

One canny Scotswoman, Isabel Hogg, said[25] to the Commissioners: "Collier people suffer more than others. You must just tell Queen Victoria that we are guid, loyal subjects. Women people here do not mind work, but they object to horse work, and she would have the blessing of all the Scotch coal women if she could get them out of the pits and send them to other labor."

---

[23] *Report of the Commissioners*, etc., 1842, vol. xv, p. 162.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Both women and children showed the effects of their labor in their appearance and condition.[26] They had surprising and abnormal development of certain muscles, with stunted growth. Frequently they were crippled by accidents and heads injured by the "thrusting" (the pressure with the head against a coal cart to force it up an incline). Curvatures of the spine were frequent, enlarged joints common. They were subject to diseases of the blood, like boils, and to serious inflammation of the lungs due to constant breathing of coal dust in the mines which had no effective systems of ventilation.

In one year,[27] in one thousand cases, there were fifty-eight deaths under thirteen and sixty-two between thirteen and eighteen.

The following table[28] of wages shows how little this terrible labor brought into the family coffers,—

For men	A maximum of 25 shillings
Children, 5 to 6 years	2s. 6d.
" 6 " 7 "	2s. 6d.
" 7 " 8 "	2s. 8d.
" 8 " 9 "	3s. 0d.
" 9 " 10 "	3s. 5d.
" 10 " 11 "	4s. 0d.
" 11 " 12 "	4s. 7d.
" 12 " 13 "	5s. 4d.
" 14 " 15 "	7s. 2d.
" 15 " 16 "	7s. 10d.
" 16 " 17 "	8s. 7d.
" 17 " 18 "	10s. 3d.

In Scotland and Wales the abominable truck[29] system of payment of wages prevailed, so that when the colliers received their wages there was seldom anything which was not already due at the store where they paid nearly twenty-five per cent more for purchases than they cost five miles away. Children's wages, too, were paid partly in "truck." [30]

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 136.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 155.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 159.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

The influence of such a report as this was tremendous. Lord Ashley comments upon it in his diary[31] under date of May 7, 1842. "The report of the Commission is out, a noble document. The Home Office (Sir James Graham was Home Secretary and Peel the head of the Government) in vain endeavors to hold it back; it came by a most providential mistake into the hands of most of the members—and though the Secretary of State prevented the sale of it for a long time, he could not prevent publicity or any notice of motion. Perhaps even 'civilization' itself never exhibited such a mass of sin and cruelty. The disgust felt is very great, thank God, but will it be reduced to action when I call for a remedy?" And under date of May 14 he writes,[32] "The Government cannot, if it would, refuse the bill of which I have given notice to exclude females and children from coalpits—the feeling in my favor has become quite enthusiastic; the Press on all sides is working most vigorously. Wrote pointedly to the editor of the *Morning Chronicle* thanking him for his support, which is most effective."

In the Commons a very slight attempt was made to prevent the bringing in of the bill. "In Staffordshire," remarked[33] one member, "mining is looked upon as a cheerful, healthy, and pleasant occupation." "And," he asks, "should not children be brought up to habits of industry rather than idleness? It might be necessary to prevent the further employment of women at this time, but nothing more."

Lord Ashley's measure proposed[34] to abolish the work of women and girls and boys under ten years in the mines and to permit boys between ten and thirteen to labor for twelve hours every other day.

The Marquess of Londonderry led the opposition in the Lords. He showed[35] letters attempting to prove that the com-

---

[31] Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, vol. i, p. 418.
[32] *Ibid.*
[33] *Hansard* 3rd S. xliv, c. 424.
[34] *Ibid.*, c. 426.
[35] *Ibid.*, c. 538.

missioners were ignorant and biased and that miners' families, if this bill was passed, would be starved. He resented the disclosures of the report, declaring[36] that there was no set of men in the world who did more justice to those employed by them than the coal owners of the North. Others opposed[37] the bill on the ground that the trade in coal would be altogether annihilated.

Others argued that regulation for the women was perhaps necessary, but nothing need be done to regulate the labor of the children, "whose own fathers were usually the ones with whom they entered the pits." "These children are unusually healthy and Lord Ashley's bill would force deterioration of their health, because with increased poverty they could not live so well," was the naive argument advanced by one of the coalowners, who further showed the depth of his interest in his employees by his assertion[38] that "he must say of the children employed in his own mines that great attention was paid to their moral and religious habits. He required all children to attend regularly, not only a place of worship but also the Sunday school"—(it must be remembered that at this time child mine workers were busy six days, twelve to fourteen hours a day).

One cannot but be amused at one member[39] who is indignant at the cuts inserted by the Commissioners in their report,—cuts portraying the severity and toilsome nature of all the work of the women and children. "They are an indecent mode of attracting attention and one which is likely to lead to exaggeration."

The Government had in the beginning expressed great sympathy with the measure, but when the Lords showed[40] opposition and appointed a Select Committee for investigation, their enthusiasm waned perceptibly.

In the Lords the Marquess of Londonderry presented[41] reso-

[36] *Ibid.*, c. 543.
[37] *Ibid.*, c. 936.
[38] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxiv, c. 1001.
[39] *Ibid.*, c. 1004.
[40] *Ibid.*, c. 1168.
[41] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxv, c. 5.

lutions of the United Committee of Coal Owners, who declared that boys should be allowed to enter the mines as workers at the age of ten, since, if they began later, they could not acquire the necessary habits to become satisfactory adult miners; that the bill would be a great handicap to families, and an especial hardship to widows to have the children kept out of the pit; that the clause concerning those tending the engines (the evidence showed that it was customary to leave the engine which raised the coal and the workers to the surface, in charge of children as young as eight) should not read eighteen years.

The Earl of Radnor opposed[42] the bill because he objected to interference in the labor market by government authority and because he disapproved of any attempt to enforce morality by Act of Parliament. He had believed the bill, from the first, to be entirely unnecessary. The Marquess of Londonderry declared[43] that the women brought up the coal on ladders, carrying it on their backs and much preferred this mode of gaining a livelihood because wages were greater than in any other employment. And beside, the collieries yielded little profit as it was, and if they had to employ men to do the work which was now performed by women, eventually many of the collieries would have to be given up. The colliers themselves, he assures[44] the Lords, were anxious that women's labor should continue and the women engaged in this labor were ready (so he was informed) to go before a justice of the peace and declare that they did not object to work below ground, *because they were unable to secure other employment.* The full implication of the statement of the women he does not seem to see.

The Government had announced[45] by this time that it would take no active part as a body, but would act only as individuals, and Lord Ashley felt[46] that Peel delayed the readings of the bill as

---

[42] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxv, c. 113.
[43] *Ibid.*, c. 119.
[44] *Ibid.*, c. 119.
[45] *Ibid.*, c. 7.
[46] Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury* (Diary quoted), vol. i, pp. 419-420.

far as possible. It was, however, just at the time of one of the attempts upon the life of the young Queen Victoria, and that caused confusion in Government circles which might well be responsible for many conditions. Later, Ashley seems to have felt that perhaps he had wronged Peel in his thoughts, for he writes[47] in his diary, under date of August 1 (on July 13, through Lord Wharncliffe, the Government had announced that it would be entirely passive, giving no support to the bill), "Peel said to me the other evening, 'I shall be as great a sufferer as most people by the bill, but it will be perfectly right; the evidence could not be resisted,—though I shall be so great a sufferer, I assure you I have not offered the slightest impediment.' I told him I believed his statement. I could not, however, pay compliments for he ought to have done far more than give this negative aid,—he ought to have cooperated vigorously."

The third reading of the bill took place on August 1, 1842, and the bill was passed.[48] The Lords, however, demanded certain amendments. Ashley and Viscount Palmerston fought the amendments vigorously, Palmerston not hesitating to bait[49] the Government "whose cordial support he regretted. He would not accuse them of backing out of their intentions, but their reluctance to object to the amendments proved that there was a power greater than their own which exercised a sort of coercion over them."

The Commons, fearing to press the matter too far, decided to accept the amendments, and the bill[50] became law on August 10, 1842. It was known as "An Act to Prohibit the Employment of Women and Girls in Mines and Collieries, to Regulate the Employment of Boys, and to Make Provisions Relating to Persons Working Therein." It provided that no women under eighteen were to be employed in mines after three months from that date, and after March 1, 1843, no women or girls whatso-

---

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 431.
[48] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxv, c. 891.
[49] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxv, c. 1097.
[50] *5 and 6 Victoria*, c. 99.

ever were to be employed. No boys under ten years of age were to be employed, and paid and qualified inspectors were to be chosen who should have free access to every mine at all times, and should investigate and report upon conditions. No boy under ten was to be apprenticed and the indenture could only last for eight years. No steam or other engine was to be in charge of anyone under fifteen years of age.

In 1843 a last attempt was made to prevent the bill from complete abolition of the women from the mines. Cumming Bruce tried[51] to persuade the House to permit the introduction of a bill which would permit the labor of women over eighteen years if single or widowed. He based most of his arguments upon the suffering which he declared had been brought about by the cutting off of this source of wages. Lord Ashley fought his request strongly, declaring the move to be actuated by "the selfish and most mercenary plans of certain coal and iron masters who were desirous of overthrowing the bill just passed." "These lamentations for destitute females are crocodile tears." The attempt was defeated[52] by a vote of 114 majority. Of this attempt, Lord Ashley wrote,[53] "Have just returned from the House of Commons. Cumming Bruce attempted a repeal of the Colliery Act. He called it the modification of a clause, but such tampering is suspicious and full of danger. I resisted his bringing in the Bill and defeated him, 137 to 23. God be praised! No one was thoroughly odious but Roebuck, who I thought was with me. He entered into a long argument about interference with the rights of labor, but the Government was cordial."

In 1844 a Commission was appointed to inquire into the operation of the Act of 1842 and its report[54] was entirely favorable. "At first the difficulty experienced by the work people was very great, but by April first (one month after the Act was

[51] *Hansard* 3rd S. lxix, c. 429.

[52] *Ibid.*, c. 461.

[53] Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, vol. i, p. 491.

[54] *Report of the Commissioners Appointed Under the Provisions of the Act 5 and 6 Victoria*, c. 99, *to Enquire Into the Operation of that Act*, 1844, vol. xvi, p. 182.

in full operation) the matters began to be adjusted" and "the general result[55] appears to be that the displacement of female labor from the mines, especially in Scotland, has been effected, not indeed without some temporary suffering, but with less than was anticipated,—and the ultimate consequence of the change will be eminently beneficial to all engaged in mining labor, a wise consideration for whose best interests was the chief motive which recommended so important a change to the legislature."

2. The Promoters of the Legislation to Remove Women and Girls from the Mines

The history of this legislation is unique in the brevity of the time which elapsed between the introduction of the subject and the passage and operation of the law. Conditions were so bad that no argument supporting them was valid, no defense had any serious influence, no attempt at justification carried any weight.

Here, as in factory legislation and as in that in behalf of the child chimney sweeps, (a) Lord Ashley was the prime mover. He was, as has already been said, an Anglican in religious affiliations, but an Anglican openly and avowedly, under the influence of Evangelical ideas. The first second to his motion to bring in a bill to remove women and girls from the mines was made by (b) Mr. Brotherton, who was, in the interim between Parliamentary sessions, a pastor of what was known as the Bible Christian Church. (c) Fox Maule, a Presbyterian, was also one of the first to respond to Lord Ashley's appeal. There was in reality almost no opposition of any strength in the Commons. The chief opposition came from the Lords, who were, of course, largely Anglican. It must be remembered, however, that the opposition was chiefly from Anglicans, not because they, as religious adherents to certain tenets, were opposed to this remedial legislation, but because the Established Church and the Lords were the two great centers of the conservative, property-owning class.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

VI

THE NEWGATE PRISON SCHOOLS AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT

1. The Origin and Development of the Schools

Penology, even in the present century, is based largely upon the theory that society possesses and should exercise the right to "avenge" crime in its punishment of the criminal; that it should "get even" with malefactors who dare to transgress the laws established for the protection and welfare of the social body; that it should prevent and control all anti-social manifestations by a harshly inculcated policy of "terrorizing." Some advance from this conception has been made in recent years toward a new point of view of the criminal and a new understanding of the function of punishment. This new concept seeks to deal with the law breaker in such fashion that he is once more brought within the social body, that his reform may be accomplished rather than that vengeance may be wreaked upon him. It seeks to attack the conditions which produced the criminal. Our only real satisfaction, however, in contemplating the general conception of the function of punishment in the twentieth century is in contrasting conditions of to-day with those which existed a century and more ago. Evidence proves that advance, however limited, has certainly been made.

The state of prisons in the eighteenth century was well known to the people of the day. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge had proposed changes in Newgate prison as early as 1700 and had sought to bring the great need of reform to the attention of Parliament. James Oglethorpe, the colonizer of Georgia,[1] had made the same attempt. The Methodists,[2]

[1] Cf. E. M. North, *Early Methodist Philanthropy*, New York, 1914, p. 52.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 52-63.

under the Wesleys and Whitefield, tried to make the prisoners more comfortable and to give them religious consolation in the hope of an immortal life to come. But the early Methodists were not of the enfranchised classes and could not therefore avail themselves of political influence and weapons to force Parliamentary attention and action. Moreover, Methodist philanthropy, like all humanitarianism of both secular and religious bodies of its day, was based on a "pity" or "mercy" motive and was consequently more concerned with assistance to be rendered *within* the conditions than with the possible need of attacking the sources of those conditions themselves.

A letter[3] of Wesley, written under date of January, 1761, gives a glimpse of the circumstances of his time.

To the Editor of the *London Chronicle,*
SIR—

Of all the seats of woe on this side Hell, few, I suppose, exceed or even equal Newgate. If any region of horror could exceed it, a few years ago Newgate in Bristol did; so great was the filth, the stench, the misery, and the wickedness which shocked all who had a spark of humanity left. How was I surprised then when I was there a few weeks ago. Every part of it, above stairs and below, even the pit wherein the felons are confined at night, is as clean and sweet as a gentleman's house; it being a rule that every prisoner wash and cleanse his apartment thoroughly twice a week. Here is no fighting or brawling. If any thinks himself aggrieved the cause is immediately referred to the keeper, who hears the offending parties face to face and decides the affair at once. The usual grounds of quarreling are taken away for it is very rarely that any one cheats or wrongs another, as being sure if anything of this kind is discovered, to be more closely confined; here is no drunkenness suffered, however advantageous it might be to the keeper and tapster,—nor any whoredom, the women prisoners being narrowly observed and kept apart from the men, and no women of the town admitted; no, not at any price. All possible care is taken to prevent idleness; those who are willing to work at their callings are provided with tools and materials, partly by the keeper who gives them credit at a very moderate profit, partly by the alms occasionally

[3]Quoted in E. M. North, *Early Methodist Philanthropy,* p. 59.

given which are divided with the utmost impartiality. Accordingly, at this time, a shoemaker, a tailor, a brazier, and a coachmaker are all employed. On the Lord's day they neither work nor play but dress themselves as clean as they can to attend the public service in the chapel at which every person under the roof is present. None is excused, unless sick; in which case he is provided both with advice and medicines. To assist them in spirituals as well as temporals they have a sermon preached every Sunday and Thursday and a large Bible is chained at one side of the chapel which any of the prisoners may read. By the blessing of God on these regulations the prison has now a new face. Nothing offends either the eye or the ear, and the whole has the appearance of a quiet, serious family. And does not the keeper of Newgate deserve to be remembered full as well as the man of Ross? May the Lord remember him in that day! Meanwhile, will no one follow his example?

I am, sir,
Your humble servant,
JOHN WESLEY.

This improvement at Newgate was due to the keeper, who had been converted to Methodism, and to his humanity even Dr. Johnson pays[4] a tribute.

The beginnings of definite systematized effort to secure prison reform in England date to the late eighteenth century, when John Howard was appointed High Sheriff of Bedford. The first thing that attracted his attention when he assumed his office was a sign[5] hanging in the gaol which read, "All persons that come to this place either by warrant, committment, or verbally must pay before discharge fifteen shillings and four pence to the gaoler and two shillings to the turnkey." This was the method by which the gaoler was paid and as a result, since there were many who had no means whatsoever for payment, persons were found languishing in gaol of whom some had been acquitted and against others not even a prosecutor had appeared, but who, lacking the money to pay the gaoler, were not released.

Howard at once began every effort to change this condi-

[4]Quoted in E. M. North, *Early Methodist Philanthropy*, p. 58-59.
[5]John Field, *Life of John Howard*, London, 1850, p. 101.

tion and was successful in securing the passage of an act[6] of Parliament forbidding the practice and arranging for a salary system. This was his first step toward reform. After he had spent some time at Bedford improving conditions he made a tour of investigation of the prisons and gaols of England and Wales and the conditions he found[7] are a chamber of horrors. Prisoners were loaded with irons, sometimes two or three prisoners chained together and fastened to a central pillar. The night dungeons were seldom larger than seven feet square to accommodate three men usually fettered together. The gaols were often built over or adjoining an open sewer and the odors were terrible, while gaol fever was a commonplace and daily affair. Women sick with smallpox were found lying among the groups in the abominably crowded quarters apportioned to the female prisoners, and in one place[8] men and women had been confined together for five days and nights in a roofless dungeon whose floor was covered in the wet season with several inches of water

At Plymouth[9] there were two rooms set aside for felons, the one used at night being seventeen feet long by eight wide and five and one-half feet high. Its only ventilation was a wicket in the door, seven by five inches in dimension, where the three men confined there at the time of Howard's visit came by turns for a breath of air. At Ely[10] the prison was insecure (it was owned by the Bishop of Ely)[11] and in order to prevent possible escape of the prisoners they had been chained on their backs upon iron bars resting on the floor. To prevent their heads from lying on the floor they had iron spiked collars about their necks, and to make escape doubly impossible a heavy iron bar laid and fastened across their shins.

Whatever one man could do with the assistance of the

---

[6] *14 George III*, c. 20.

[7] John Howard, *State of Prisons in England and Wales with Preliminary Observations and an Account of Some Foreign Prisons*, London, 1784 (?).

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 386.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 350.

[10] Howard, *State of Prisons*, p. 299.

[11] Cf. Appendix of Field's *Life of Howard*.

friends who rallied to him, Howard accomplished. He secured the passage of a bill[12] to establish better sanitary conditions in the gaols; he followed this by a second act[13] to raise the standard of treatment of criminals, and had copies of these two statutes printed at his own expense and distributed all through the British kingdom. They seem, however, to have been very generally evaded, for widespread public sentiment did not yet demand reform. The little Howard had been able to accomplish seems to have gradually disappeared after his death, and Newgate prison which the nineteenth century knew was the veritable Hell to which Wesley had compared it.

When the nineteenth century dawned it was upon scenes of intense confusion in England. Political uncertainty and industrial upheaval, social disturbances, and economic revolution combined in complicating the machinery of a society whose mechanisms had already been roughly jarred by events across the Channel. Foreign affairs seemed to engross the attention of the English legislators and populace, to the exclusion of domestic matters whose serious and threatening purport was unnoticed and ignored. All that had been done by Howard and his associates had apparently been forgotten and the penal code itself was the relic of the barbarism of a savage age. "In the early nineteenth century, for no fewer than two hundred offenses, the death penalty could still be legally inflicted; legal procedure was antiquated and defective,—the innocent were sometimes convicted, the guilty constantly escaped. The severity of the law defeated its own object. It blunted the moral conscience of the Nation, it obliterated the distinction between offenses trivial and grave,—it encouraged serious and persistent crime, it failed to deter the casual offender. Criminal procedure was reduced to a farce. Juries naturally refused to convict for petty offenses when conviction might cost the offender his life. Poachers and shoplifters were sentenced to death by the score but rarely suffered the penalty of death. Of six hundred and fifty-five persons

[12] *14 George III*, c. 59.
[13] *19 George III*, c. 54.

indicted for shoplifting between 1805 and 1807, one hundred and thirteen were sentenced to death, but in not one case was the penalty enforced. On the other hand, between 1811 and 1818 over one hundred persons went to the gallows for the crime of forgery." [14] (It must also be remembered that all executions were public at this time, and were scenes of mob enthusiasm and morbid enjoyment.)

Newgate Prison was the gaol for both criminals and debtors for the county of Middlesex and city of London, and no picture can possibly overdraw the horrors existing there. The English were slow to listen to tales of legal wrong, slower still to believe, and more tardy yet to act.[15]

It may seem somewhat arbitrary to introduce a chapter on prison reform in a paper treating of activities in behalf of children in the early nineteenth century, but it is deemed justifiable, since the work of Mrs. Fry and the group associated with her, began directly and primarily, with the children of the prisoners,—indeed had no other initial object than the betterment of conditions for these wretched little people. Here, however, as in factory reform, as in all modern attempts to aid children,—it was soon discovered that the work with and for the children was entirely futile unless something was accomplished for the adults with whose lives their own were so closely interwoven.

The entrance of Elizabeth Fry into Newgate Prison was not at all dramatic, so far as she herself was concerned, but was of far-reaching import for the social influence in determining questions and means of law and its enforcement. Mrs. Fry was a

---

[14] J. A. R. Marriott, *England Since Waterloo,* London, 1913, p. 68.

[15] As the *Edinburgh Review* said later in speaking of prison reform (February, 1822), "Statements (in regard to the extent of the reform accomplished by the efforts of Elizabeth Fry) should be correct and views practical and all strong assertions should be supported by strong documents. The English are a calm, reflecting people: they will give time and money when they are convinced. In the midst of the most heartrending narrative, Bull demands the day of the month, the year of our Lord, the name of the parish, and the countersign of three or four respectable householders. After these affecting circumstances he can no longer hold out, but gives way to the kindness of his nature,—puffs—blubbers—and subscribes."

member of the Society of Friends,[16] whose religious foundations demand activity and zeal in world remaking.

---

[16]The story of the work of the Society of Friends for social betterment, has not apparently been written. It is a field teeming with material and promising the richest of rewards in the light that will be thrown on the background of the social movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is very doubtful if any other group has manifested so keen a sense of responsibility for the conditions of the world they lived in, such willingness to make personal sacrifice for the ends in view and such modesty in achievement as the Quakers. No matter how great their sense of desire to save their own souls, it has not dwarfed their efforts for the material and spiritual improvement of those with whom they came in contact.

As the slightest and most obvious suggestions of the breadth of activity of the Quakers, the following names and the causes which they promoted or with which they were prominently identified, are submitted,—(a) George Fox—*Journal* filled with exhortations toward activities for popular welfare. He himself established schools. (Cf. article on Anglican promotion of Education for the Poor.) (b) John Bellers—1696—Proposal for a *College for Industry of all Useful Trades and Husbandry.* Probably the first suggestion of the plan which has developed into the "industrial" and the "industrial-reform" school. (c) Educational Activities, (cf. article on "The Educational Activities of the Society of Friends" in the *Cyclopedia of Education*), Paul Monroe, Editor. (1) Dr. Lancaster and the School at Southwark (Cf. chapter on "Anglican Promotion of Education," etc.). (2) The Sidcot School. (3) Wm. Forster, the sponsor of the first reasonable elementary education bill (1870), *Hansard* 3rd S. 199. p. 438. (d) William Allen—Partner of Owen at New Lanark, President of the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of Factory Children, Editor of the *Philanthropist,* 1811-1813, Abolitionist and Prison Reformer. (e) Sir Thomas Fowel Buxton—Prison Reformer and Abolitionist. (f) J. J. Gurney—Abolitionist. (g) Samuel Tuke—Care of the Insane. *Description of the Retreat,* London, 1813. (h) Samuel Gurney and J. J. Fry—Promoters of Legislation vs. the Opium Trade with China. (i) John Woolman—American slavery abolition. Anthony Benezet—American slavery abolition. In speaking of the early social activities of the Quakers, Wm. Braithwaite in his *Beginnings of Quakerism,* London, 1912, says (*Intro.*, p. xliii), "So absorbed in work for social betterment were they, so consecrated to the task of remaking the world, that many who have studied the early Quakers have seen only this practical—or perhaps ideal—side of the movement and have neglected the mystical side of their religion. But both these aspects belong together. The Quaker movement is significant, is worth studying, because it shows both strands (social activity and philanthropic effort combined with a mystic sense of the spirit) woven into one organic whole. It is a very real experiment in religion and one that is full of lessons for our age and for all Christian communions." True as this may be for early Quakerism it is even more

George Fox himself,[17] when in Mansfield and just released from prison, spoke to the justices against the manifest injustice of setting a very low wage, perforce legal, for the labor of the farm workers. Debt he regarded as socially wrong[18] and his interest in the care of the poor and miserable and the education of their children is expressed again and again.[19] In 1658 he "warned" the Merchants that they should "lay aside their superfluity, and with it to nourish the poor and have a place provided where all poor blind, lame cripples should be placed and properly nursed, and set those that could work to work." [20] In one of his many imprisonments he wrote to the justices (1651) "remarking the pernicious effects" of keeping prisoners long in gaol as it furnished them opportunity by recording their feats of villainy, to corrupt each other more and to initiate the fresh men into the mysteries of ingenious and daring depredation—so that they generally came out more confirmed in vice and debauchery. He therefore "thought it his duty to communicate his observations hereon to the judges and to point out the necessity to prevent these bad consequences as prejudicial to the peace and security of society." [21]

At the same time he was much affected by commiseration for those unhappy wretches "who forfeited their liberty and their lives to the laws of their country and especially that the lives of men should be taken away even for small thefts. So great was his compassion for a young woman in prison at the same time as himself, under sentence of death for stealing a small sum of money from her master, that he wrote to the judges and magistrates and "moved them to mercy," and while not certain that pity was produced by his letter the young woman was reprieved

---

true for the period following the great religious revival of the eighteenth century. The most cursory examination of sources affirms this.

[17] *Journal of George Fox,* London, 1852, p. 65.

[18] No. 200 of *Epistles to Friends,* quoted by Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism,* p. 516.

[19] Braithwaite, p. 330.

[20] *Doctrinals of George Fox,* pp. 127-130, quoted by Braithwaite, p. 523.

[21] *Journal of George Fox,* p. 96.

at the gallows and given *life imprisonment.*[22] In evidence of the Quaker attitude toward general charity, the words of John Gough may be quoted,[23] "It is a remarkable influence of the charity and mutual benevolence that prevails amongst these people that they have never suffered their poor to fall an encumbrance on their parishes; but have ever afforded them a comfortable support amongst themselves, and at the same time evidence the universality of their benevolence by a readiness with the foremost to contribute to the support of the common poor, both in their quota of the poor tax and in extending private charity to deserving objects within their notice."

And again,—"at the Skipton general meeting (1660) several sessions were established for the purpose of assisting and making provision for the poor, the poor of other societies frequently gathering in crowds to partake of the liberality of the Friends." [24]

This, then, was the type of work expected from all who regarded themselves as members of the Society of Friends. Of the two constituent elements[25] of the religion of the Quakers,—the mystic sense of the spirit, and practical philanthropic activity, Elizabeth Fry was a perfect prototype. She belonged to a family of Friends dating their ancestry to coworkers with Fox but not "strict and consistent Friends" since they permitted dancing, attractive dressing, and were not especially firm in the tenets of their faith.[26]

The Journal of the young Elizabeth is filled with her struggle with herself over her pleasure in worldly enjoyment and shows clearly the intensity of emotion which later developed into the strongest of religious faiths. No commonplace, phlegmatic acceptance of things as they were, no mere formal codified religion,

---

[22] *Journal of George Fox,* p. 96.

[23] John Gough, *History of the People Called Quakers,* Dublin, 1789, vol. i, p. 141.

[24] Gough, i, p. 432.

[25] See note elsewhere.

[26] *Memoirs of the Life of Elizabeth Fry.* Edited by her daughters. London, 1847, vol. i, p. 2.

no devotion to the pleasures of society, could possibly have satisfied the nature of Elizabeth Gurney. We see her first riding horseback in a scarlet riding habit in company with the Duke of Gloucester, quartered at Norwich nearby, and writing (a girl not seventeen), "I feel how much entering the world hurts me—it excites a false stimulus such as love of pomp, pride, vanity, jealousy, and ambition. I have lately been given up a good deal to worldly passions,—by what I have felt I can easily imagine I should soon be led quite away." [27] Again, "there is a sort of luxury in giving way to the feelings—I love to feel for the sorrows of others, to pour oil and wine into the wounds of the afflicted; there is a luxury in feeling the heart glow whether it be with joy or sorrow." [28] "I have known my faults and not corrected them—I must not flirt—I must not be ever out of temper with the children, I must not contradict without a cause, I must not mump when my sisters are liked and I am not." [29] "Idle and relaxed in mind to-day, greatly dissipated by hearing the band. Music has a great effect on me, at times it makes me feel almost beside myself." [30] It is not strange that to a heart which naturally surged with emotion, the peace of the Quaker religion should appeal in every way.

The visit of Wm. Savery, an American Friend just then in England, was the turning point. Elizabeth Gurney's sister describes the occasion of his speech at Norwich. "On that day, as usual, we seven sisters sat in a row under the gallery at meeting. I sat by Betsy, who was generally rather restless at meeting and I remember that I was greatly amused by her very smart boots, which were purple laced with scarlet. At last Wm. Savery began to speak. His voice and manner were arresting and we all liked the sound, but Betsy became very agitated and began to weep. The next day Wm. Savery came to breakfast and talked to my sister of the high and important calling she would

---

[27] *Extract from Journal in Memoirs* (Ed. by Daugh.), i, p. 18.
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

be led into. From that day her love of pleasure and the world seemed gone." [31]

Of Savery's preaching Elizabeth Gurney herself wrote,[32] "My imagination has been worked upon and I fear that all I have felt will go off. I wish the state of enthusiasm I am now in may last, for to-day I have felt that there is a God. I hope to be truly virtuous but religious only so far as will lead to virtue." A trip to London and a long round of gaieties pleased and amused but did not satisfy her and by her eighteenth birthday she expresses her liking for the "plain Friends" [33] and before her marriage to Joseph Fry, when twenty years of age (the year 1800), she wore the simple garb and used the simple speech of the plain Quakers. This evidence of the inward struggle of the young girl between her natural enjoyment of worldly gaiety and her deep religious feeling, is cited for the reason that in after years she expressed her belief that her success with the convict women was due to her understanding of the spiritual conflict.

The early years of her girlhood had been filled with interest in the poor. Beginning with a school consisting of the little son of a poor woman in whom she was interested, the number grew so large that she had to hold its sessions in a disused laundry belonging to her home and there, without any assistance, she taught and controlled seventy children of the neighboring poor,[34] Betsy's "imps," as her sisters called them.

In her young married life, although busied with the cares of a household often filled with guests—for Quakers were notably hospitable—attending to the many wants of children, of whom eleven were born by the time she was little past forty, the claims of the poor of her neighborhood were always recognized and her interest in the activities in their behalf never wavered. Her *Journal* of February 15, 1801,[35] tells of her visit to the school of

---

[31] *Memoirs,* i, p. 34.
[32] *Journal,* February 4, 1798, quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 35.
[33] *Memoirs,* i, p. 48.
[34] *Memoirs,* i, p. 62.
[35] Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 103.

Joseph Lancaster at Southwark, and under date of October, 1804, certain discoveries and interests of her own.[36] One very cold winter day she was accosted by a woman who had a baby in her arms very ill with whooping cough. Distressed at the child's condition and suspicious of the woman from the manner in which her offers of visits and assistance were received, Mrs. Fry followed the woman and saw her enter a dilapidated dwelling where she herself entered, finding a number of sick and neglected babies. The next day she returned to the house and found the woman and children gone and the place entirely empty. Inquiry brought out the fact that these were parish children boarded out to the woman, who kept them in this condition not only to assist her in begging but by shortening their lives and concealing their deaths, to continue to obtain the allowance allotted to their care. This was a common fate of parish children.

Mrs. Fry was appointed visitor and director of the school and workhouse of the Friends at Islington[37] and was keenly interested in the welfare of the children there. After her removal to Plashet, the ancestral home of her husband, she established a large girls' school there and placed it in charge of a young woman who had been an assistant at Joseph Lancaster's school[38] in Southwark. Besides these interests outside her family, there was a large Irish colony near her home full of disorder, poverty, and filth, and here wonders were worked through her agency. Smallpox was practically unknown in her neighborhood for she learned how to vaccinate and performed the operation on all the poor around her.[39] In one especially hard winter she provided soup and bread for hundreds, keeping an outhouse of her home dedicated to its preparation. These are the indications of her temperament and interests. In 1810 she became a minister of the Society of Friends, serving con-

---

[36] *Ibid.*, 117.
[37] *Memoirs*, i, 124.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 169.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

stantly for thirty-two years despite the manifold calls upon her time and care which rose from her family and other activities.

In January, 1813, Stephen Grellet, with two other members of the Society of Friends, went to Newgate to visit certain criminals who were under sentence of death. Mr. Grellet, so he tells,[40] after talking to the criminals who were to be executed the next day, was asked to go to the women's side of the prison. "There were many sick women there lying on the bare floor or on some old straw, having very scanty covering over them, although it was quite cold, and among them were several young children born in the prison and almost naked. On leaving that abode of misery and wretchedness I went immediately to my much-valued friend, Elizabeth Fry, stating that something must be done for those poor suffering children at once. The appeal was not in vain —and on the very next day she repaired to the prison with a bundle of made up garments for the naked children. What she then saw of the wretchedness of that prison induced her to devise some plan toward the amelioration of the condition of these poor people."

Of this entry into the prison scene of her later activities, Elizabeth Fry makes the following mention in her journal,[41] "Yesterday we were some hours at Newgate with the poor female felons, attending to their outward necessities. We have been there twice previously. Before we went away, dear Anna Buxton (a Quaker and the sister of Mrs. Fry's brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, one of the most active prison reformers of the nineteenth century) uttered a few words in supplication, and very unexpectedly I did also. I heard weeping and I thought they appeared much tendered; a very solemn quiet was observed; it was a striking scene—the poor people on their knees around us in their deplorable condition."

An investigation, ordered in 1814, showed[42] a condition in

---

[40] *Memoirs of Stephen Grellet,* Edited by Ben. Seebohm, Philadelphia, 1867, p. 224.

[41] *Journal of Elizabeth Fry Quoted in Memoirs,* vol. i, p. 204.

[42] *Hansard* xxvii, c. 748 and xxviii, c. 70.

London gaols and prisons which was not only regrettable but indecent, and the bill to improve conditions was defeated on the ground that *when* there was more space, all difficulties would be met, since the trouble was chiefly overcrowding, and that if the bill was passed the London Aldermen would feel degraded and disgraced.[43]

At this time the women prisoners in Newgate were confined in a very small portion of the prison, the narrow yard, the two wards and the two cells of which their division consisted (about one hundred and ninety square yards in area) being separated from the quarters of the state prisoners (mostly men) by a partition wall of height insufficient to prevent overlooking from the windows. Into this space were crowded, when Mrs. Fry first began her work, over three hundred women and children.[44] In 1818, five years later, the investigation of the committee of the House brought from Mrs. Fry the information that even then (1818) the women had sleeping space (on the floor) six feet in length by one and one half to two feet in width.[45]

The children were mostly under seven and were for the greater part the children of prisoners admitted according to prison law, with the convicts, but some few of them had been committed for law-breaking.[46] Women and children were herded together, tried and untried, hardened and first offenders, without classification or employment. Their only attention was from an old man and his son who had charge day and night. Without sufficient clothing, in rags and filth, they spent their days and passed their nights without bedding on the bare floor—a raised plank for a pillow. They lived, cooked, and washed in the same room and the abundance of liquor bought from a tap

---

[43] *Ibid.*, xxviii, c. 529.

[44] *Memoirs of Elizabeth Fry*, i, p. 205.

[45] *Minutes of Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons in the Inquiry into the State of Prisons of the Metropolis*, 1818, vol. viii, p. 338.

[46] Thomas Timpson, *A Memoir of Elizabeth Fry*, London, 1847, p. 32.

in the prison with the proceeds of their begging, added to the lawlessness existing everywhere.[47]

Sir T. F. Buxton, in his *Enquiry*,[48] portrays the scene as his sister-in-law described it to him. "All I tell thee is a faint picture of the reality; the filth, the closeness of the rooms, the ferocious expression and manner of the women toward each other, and the abandoned wickedness which everything bespoke are quite indescribable. Two women were seen stripping a dead child while a living one stood by waiting for the clothing."

Many imperative home affairs prevented the return of Mrs. Fry for nearly three years (until 1816), but at that time her visits were recommenced. She was greatly distressed over the children who, half naked, were pining away without proper food, clothing, or exercise, and who were exposed to the most complete contamination. She spoke to the mothers about their children, telling them of the certain results of living in such utter depravity and enquiring whether they would like to have a school formed, but being careful to assure them that unless they would promise steady cooperation she would not undertake it.[49] Their eagerness to seize on the slightest opportunity which promised good for their children was pathetic, and they acknowledged that they could not like to hear them using oaths and filthy words in the first syllables they spoke.

Mrs. Fry then approached the governor of the prison on the subject and he, with the sheriffs, assured her that such an attempt was useless and, moreover, the prison was so crowded that there was no spot suitable. She asked to be admitted to the women again and, after searching for a while, found a vacant cell which was turned into a schoolroom.[50] Determined that the women themselves should be active factors in the school, she left

---

[47]*Memoirs*, i, p. 205.

[48]Thomas Fowell Buxton, *An Enquiry whether Crime and Misery are Produced or Prevented by our Present System of Prison Discipline*, London, 1818, p. 118.

[49]*Minutes of Evidence to the Committee of the House*, 1818, p. 331.

[50]T. F. Buxton, *Enquiry*, p. 121.

the choice of schoolmistress to them and found, on her return the next day, that they had selected a young woman, Mary Connor by name, who was under sentence for stealing a watch. Pardon was granted to her about fifteen months after the establishment of the school, but her release came too late and she died very shortly of tuberculosis.[51]

The description of the opening day of the school is a vivid one:[52] "The women were reading lewd books and begging at the gratings with long-handled spoons thrust through the iron rods to the visitors and were fighting over the proceeds. The railing was crowded with half-naked women begging vociferously, while the din was increased by the younger women who were determined to be allowed to enter the school." The room was so narrow that it was impossible to admit the women, although Mrs. Fry included as "children" all under twenty-five, and the friend who was with Mrs. Fry, says, that when the door was locked behind her she felt as if she were confined in a den of wild beasts and shuddered to think that a locked door shut her in with such a herd of novel and desperate companions.

The plight of the women excited much compassion,—their constant cry was that they had nothing to do,—and "I soon found," said Mrs. Fry, "that nothing could be done or was worth attempting for their reformation without constant employment. As it was, those who were idle were confirmed in idleness and those who were disposed to be industrious lost their good habits. They went to prison, in short, to have the work of corruption completed." [53]

The school for children prospered satisfactorily, but their progress in reading, sewing, knitting, and other work was offset by the fact that they had to return to the wards at night and hence lost much of the influence of the training toward decent self-respect in the begging, swearing, gaming, dancing, and dressing up in men's clothes—common in the wards—scenes frequently

[51] *Memoirs,* vol. i, p. 260.
[52] T. F. Buxton, *Enquiry,* p. 122.
[53] T. F. Buxton, *Enquiry,* p. 119.

so bad, so Mrs. Fry told the Committee, "that we could not permit young people to enter." [54]

The boys, all under sixteen, were supposed at this time (1813-1818) to be collected and taught by a schoolmaster appointed by the Ordinary of the prison, but the hours of teaching were only four daily, the remainder of the time being spent in loafing around the yard mingling freely with the adult male convicts regardless of criminal records. The questioning of Mr. Cotton, Ordinary in 1818, brought out the fact that the schoolmaster was a convict and consequently could not hold the respect of the boys.[55] It also developed that it was customary to keep boys of thirteen and younger, when under *sentence of death,* heavily ironed and confined in separate cells.[56] This is another phase of the situation.

The appeals of the women to Mrs. Fry were so urgent, and their needs so evident, that at last she decided to try an experiment and to see if it were possible to find some method of reformation through a school for the women who had already undergone trial and were serving sentences.

When the plan was broached to the officials it met with a chilly reception. The officers of the prison thought that the idea of bringing order and industry out of Newgate was utterly visionary[57] and the Friends were assured that anything taken into the prison like books or working materials would be stolen, while any rules made would be no sooner issued than broken. Even the ladies themselves, realizing the location of the prison in a great metropolis, knowing that it was filled with London women who had the reputation of the greatest brazenness and who were accustomed to association with the masculine "gangs" which infest a city, were more than doubtful of the outcome of the experiment, but were no less determined to make the trial.[58]

[54] *Minutes of Evidence of the Committee of the House on the Prisons of the Metropolis,* 1818, viii, p. 336.

[55] *Ibid.,* p. 302.

[56] *Minutes of Evidence before the House,* 1818, viii, p. 311.

[57] *Memoirs,* i, p. 262.

[58] T. F. Buxton, *Enquiry,* p. 124.

They announced that if a committee could be found who would share in the labor and responsibility and a matron who would not leave the prison, day or night, they would open a school, find employment for the women, produce the necessary money until the city could be induced to take over the financial needs and be answerable for all property committed into the hands of the prisoners.

The committee, consisting of eleven members of the Society of Friends and the wife of a clergyman, and called "An Association for the Improvement of the Female Prisoners in Newgate," was formed at once and the promise of its members to devote themselves to this undertaking to the exclusion of other matters of interest, was carried out in spirit and letter. A respectable elderly woman was secured as matron[59] and the plan progressed. The Governor, Ordinary, and Sheriffs of the prison met with the ladies at the home of Mrs. Fry and after discussion of the plan agreed to give every kind of assistance, although they felt that there was no hope for results.[60]

In a few days the committee met the seventy prisoners and explained that they were ready to open a school for the women but that it would be absolutely necessary to adopt rules for its management and enforce them, and that if the women felt that they could not submit to the regulations adopted it would be useless to make any attempt for a school. The women assented with pathetic eagerness and were assured that the ladies were not there for the purpose of authority or dictation, but were ready to work with the women for the improvement of conditions and that no rules should be adopted nor monitors selected without unanimous concurrence.[61]

---

[59]From twentieth century standpoints it is interesting to hear Mrs. Fry's reply to the question of the Committee of the House on the salary of the matron. "The Court of Aldermen pay her a guinea ($5) a week and we add twenty pounds a year. No gentlewoman would stay with these women unless handsomely paid" ($353) annually. *Minutes of Evidence (Prisons)*, 1818, viii, p. 337.

[60]T. F. Buxton, *Enquiry*, p. 126.

[61]*Ibid.*, p. 127 et sqq.

There can be no doubt that Mrs. Fry's manner of dealing with the women and her personal magnetism, which everyone seems to have felt, was a larger element in the success of her work than she herself realized.

Before the school opened in the laundry that had been altered, cleaned, and whitewashed to receive it, it was necessary to find some employment for the women and that rather grave problem was solved with surprising ease. It occurred to one of the members of the committee that the women should be able to make the garments used to supply the needs of the convicts of Botany Bay and she went at once to see the firm which was accustomed to filling those orders. They acceded to her desires at once and no further delay in opening the school was necessary.

On its first morning, rules[62] were read and adopted one by one; these established classes of twelve each, in charge of a monitor selected by the women, made regulations for behavior at the grating, behavior in the work room, personal cleanliness, decency, and arrangements pertaining to their work, etc. Thus these poor wretches tasted, for the first time in their lives, of the satisfaction of sharing in a variety of citizenship.

For over a month, until some decision could be reached as to the possible permanency of the school, every effort was made to keep the activity secret. At that time, however, feeling convinced that conditions justified the move, the committee applied to the Corporation of London to have the schools made part of the prison system.[63] The Lord Mayor, the Sheriffs, and Aldermen conferred with the Committee in the prison and were so impressed by the change that had been wrought that they agreed to pay part of the expense of the schools. As one of the visiting sheriffs remarked,[64] "This hell upon earth exhibited the appearance of a well-regulated family or industrious manufactory," and another of the visitors contrasts a visit to Mrs. Fry in Newgate with a visit he had paid there before her time,—"I requested

[62]Quoted in *Memoirs*, i, p. 268.
[63]*Memoirs*, i, p. 271.
[64]Buxton, *Enquiry*, p. 131.

permission to see Mrs. Fry and was conducted by a turnkey to the entrance of the women's wards. On my approach, no dissonant sounds, no angry voices warned me of my advance to the place which had long borne the title of 'Hell above ground.' The courtyard into which I was admitted, instead of being peopled with beings scarcely human, blaspheming, fighting, tearing each other's hair or gaming with a filthy pack of cards for the very clothes they wore, which often did not suffice even for decency, presented a scene where stillness and propriety reigned. A decently-dressed person, the newly appointed yard woman, led me to the door of a ward where at the head of a long table sat a lady belonging to the Society of Friends. She was reading aloud to about sixteen women prisoners, busied in sewing, each of whom wore a clean blue apron and bib. They rose, curtsied, and resumed their work. Instead of scowls and half-suppressed laughs, their faces wore an expression of self-respect and gravity —a sort of consciousness of their improved character and the altered position in which they found themselves." [65] If this seems a matter of marvel one can have some idea of circumstances prevalent before. Conditions were by no means decent in the prison even then. The following extract from a journal kept by one of the visitors gives some slight suggestion of the picture,[66] "We proceeded to the felon's door, the steps of which were covered with their friends laden with provisions and necessities. We entered into an ante-room whose walls were hung with chains and fetters ready for newcomers, the chains being riveted to a central block. Visitors to the prisoners were searched at a little room near the entrance and a little Irish woman with a young baby was just then found to have secreted a rope to liberate her husband who was under sentence of death for forgery. She was, of course, removed to prison to await trial. At my left hand sat Lawrence surrounded by her four children and awaiting the birth of a fifth. As soon as that had taken

[65] Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 272.

[66] "Journal of Sophia de C"—Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 273.

place she was to be executed for forgery, as her husband had been a day or two before. Some of these poor women are really beautiful and even modest-looking and their faces not disfigured by the expression of sin. We left these scenes and went to the schoolrooms, whose quiet decency was quite a relief."

In 1818 a Committee[67] of the House was appointed to make an investigation into the state of prisons in London, and at that time much interesting evidence was brought out, especially from Mrs. Fry. Clothing and soap were luxuries apparently, and were provided most irregularly in accordance with the condition of the sheriff's fund which fluctuated in amount from time to time. The ladies had learned to depend entirely on their own efforts to secure clothing for the women. Until the latter part of 1818 the women did their own cooking (in the same room in which they washed and lived), and as the prison allowance was very scanty those who did not have friends on the outside to supply them with food, were usually half starved. After 1818, the authorities furnished the food and it was supplied to the women ready cooked. Neither towels nor basins were provided. The women by that time (1818) had a kind of rope mat to sleep upon and a rug to cover them—two for every three women—an allowance of sleeping space six feet in length and one and a half to two feet wide. The infirmary was clean but was so crowded that it was usually necessary to put two sick women in the same bed.

The Mayor and Aldermen signified their approval of the changes wrought by Mrs. Fry and the Committee, in an official letter,[68] and at that time, as well as before the Committee of the House,[69] Mrs. Fry made certain suggestions which were later found among her papers:[70] (a) Newgate is much in need of greater room. The women should be entirely under the care of women matrons, turnkeys, and inspecting committee. (b) There

---

[67] *Minutes of Evidence before a Committee of the House in Investigation of the State of Prisons of the Metropolis,* 1818, viii, p. 297.

[68] Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 280.

[69] *Report of the Committee,* 1818, viii, p. 338.

[70] *Memoirs,* i, p. 281.

should be as little communication between the outside friends and the women as possible. (c) The prison should supply both food and clothing so that the women may be independent of outside sources, and should supply ample. (d) Employment should be part of their punishment and should be provided by the government. Their earnings should be laid aside in part, to give them provision for immediate necessities upon their release, and should be laid out in part for the little extra comforts, such as tea and sugar, which cannot be supplied. (e) They should have their meals, work, and recreation together but should be separated at night by classes of twelve with their monitor.

In commenting on these ideas of Mrs. Fry the *Edinburgh Review*[71] of February, 1822, expresses what was probably the typical feeling of even those who desired prison reform. It is a perfect specimen of the early nineteenth century desire to meet crime with the vengeance of society. "We have the strongest belief that the present lenity of jails—the education carried on there, the cheerful assemblage—the indulgence in food (the privilege of buying sugar and tea) is one great cause of the astonishingly rapid increase in commitments. . . . Mrs. Fry is an amiable and excellent woman and ten thousand times better than the infamous neglect that preceded her,—but hers is not the method to stop crime. In prisons which are really meant to keep the multitude in order and be a terror to evil doers, there must be no sharing of the profits, no visiting of friends, no education but religious education,[72] no freedom of diet, no carpenters' benches or weavers' looms. There must be a great deal of solitude, coarse food, a dress of shame; hard, incessant, irksome, eternal labor, and unrelenting exclusion of happiness and comfort." The power of happiness as a moralizer was unrecognized in those days.

---

[71] *Edinburgh Review*, 1822 (Feb.), p. 355 et sqq.

[72] It must be remembered that there was practically no free education in those days except in religious schools, and it was said that parents urged their children to crime so that they would be jailed and educated free of charge.

Six months after the establishment of the school for children, and then that for the tried women, there came an appeal from the women of the "untried" side that the same types of schools might be instituted for them, and they promised entire obedience if their desire were granted.[73] The schools were established there but were not so successful as the others owing, probably, to the fact that the women were often engaged in preparations for trial and their minds were distracted by the hope of release.

During the years 1816-1817 the Association kept up its work as quietly[74] as possible, but in July of that year Robert Owen, the cotton manufacturer and social servant of New Lanark, published in connection with a letter to the newspapers on his plan for the manufacturing and laboring poor, an account[75] of a visit to Newgate which he had paid in company with Mrs. Fry (his Quaker partners were close friends and workers with Mrs. Fry). It was, to him, evidence of the power of effort and environment over character,—"Evident affection (for Mrs. Fry) was shown everywhere. In visiting the female school every eye was fixed upon the benefactress. The little girls, children of the prisoners, and some of them, themselves convicts, looked on her as human creatures might be supposed to look upon beings of a superior, intelligent, and beneficent nature. They were all clean and neat and some of their countenances were very interesting. The school was in excellent order and appeared to be under good management." Owen's simple vanity in his part taken in introducing Mrs. Fry's benefactions to the world, is amusing,—"Every daily morning and evening paper published it (the letter) upon the same day.—Mrs. Fry's fame was thus published in less than a week in every country and parish over the land, and by this accidental visit and publication was her success made known to the world; for previously it was unknown to any part of the

---

[73]Buxton, *Enquiry*, p. 132.

[74]The social work of the Quakers all seems to have been done with characteristic modesty.

[75]Robert Owen—*Autobiography*, Appendix I, No. 2.

public." [76] Mrs. Fry does not seem to have been so much pleased with this publication as was Owen. In her journal, she writes, "My having been brought publicly forward in the newspapers respecting what I have been instrumental in doing in Newgate has brought some anxiety with it. In the first place, as far as I am concerned, that it may neither raise me too high nor cast me too low,—and also I am anxious at being brought forward in a way I do not like and by a person whom I do not quite approve." [77]

It was the attention attracted by the work at Newgate which led to the summoning of Mrs. Fry before the Committee[78] of the House in 1818. She made no sweeping claims;—"I believe that considerable good has been gained" was her most extravagant statement. Her suggestions, however, were of interest and many of them were later adopted. She disapproved especially of the conditions among the women and children yet to undergo trial. On the untried side there was neither classification nor segregation, and criminals accused of all types of crimes were herded together awaiting trial, while on the side of those who were serving sentences, criminals of all degrees spent their days together. She believed that there were four things essential to reformation: (1) religious instruction, (2) classification, (3) abundance of employment, and (4) superintendence of the women by women only. She told the Committee that the Government should furnish the work—the needs of the Army and Navy being sufficiently great to furnish all the employment. In the ten months that had elapsed between the establishment of the school and her examination before the Committee, the women had made over twenty thousand garments and had knit between sixty and one hundred pairs of stockings and socks each month, and not one of these articles had been stolen. Their earnings were about eighteen pence per week each, and as practical evidence

---

[76] Robert Owen, *New Existence of Man upon Earth,* London, 1854, Part i, p. 25.

[77] Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 286.

[78] *Report of the Minutes of Evidence before the Committee of the House on the State of Prisons in the Metropolis,* 1818, viii, p. 297 et sqq.

of the changes that had occurred in the women, she told of one who, having learned to knit in the prison, was then supporting herself respectably outside. Another, to whom a sum of money had been lent on her discharge, came to Mrs. Fry every week with two shillings to pay upon her debt. No religious doctrines except the "duties toward God and man" were taught in the schools.

One of the incidents which showed the power of Mrs. Fry over the women, was in regard to gambling. Among the rules which had been adopted when the school was opened was one which forbade gambling. The matron reported to Mrs. Fry that some of the women were breaking that regulation and Mrs. Fry summoned the women together before her, asking them if, as a personal favor to her, they would bring her the cards. Knowing that this would betray them she hardly expected any reply, but as she was sitting with the matron a prisoner entered and, with eyes full of tears, gave her a pack of cards. Another and another followed until five packs had been handed to her,—an evidence not of compulsion but of the love in the hearts of women who a few months before had seemed scarcely human.[79]

Of all occasions most dreaded by the jailers, was the time of the transportation of the prisoners to the ships by which they were to be taken to the penal colonies. It had been long the custom to spend the night before, in breaking everything breakable in the prison and to go off shouting with the most brazen effrontery. The first time such a transfer was to be made after the installation of the schools, the jailers were astounded at hearing no tumult, only affectionate and tearful farewells to acquaintances, and the prisoners went in such quiet and order that only half the usual guard was deemed necessary.[80] Affectionate, kindly speech to women, long rejected by all reputable society, had had its effects, and "steeled against the terror of punishment, they melted to the warmth of those who felt for their sorrows, even though they reproved their misdeeds."

[79]Buxton, *Enquiry*, p. 134.
[80]*Ibid.*, p. 136.

Mrs. Fry's attitude is clearly defined in her *Hints.*[81] "In our conduct towards these unhappy women, kindness, gentleness, and true humility ought ever to be united with serenity and firmness. Nor is it safe in our intercourse with them to descend to familiarity,—for there is a dignity in the Christian character which demands and will obtain respect and which is powerful in its influence even over dissolute minds. Experience proves that if those persons who visit them are harsh and unforgiving, the effect is hurtful rather than beneficial. Neither is it wise to converse with them on the subject of the crimes of which they are accused, for such conversation is injurious both to the criminals and to those who hear it."

In that same little pamphlet Mrs. Fry suggests a need which greatly interested her. "I would strongly recommend the formation of a Ladies' Patronage Society, the object of which is to extend care and to find employment or situations for the destitute, penitent female prisoner immediately upon her release from prison." [82] The sub-committee which she desired was formed and united with the Protestant Sisters of Charity in establishing refuges, and, after her death, what was deemed the most fitting memorial to her, was planned at a meeting at which Lord Ashley presided,—the Elizabeth Fry refuge for discharged prisoners.[83]

One of the sources of greatest distress to Elizabeth Fry, and to all Quakers, was capital punishment. Her journal of February 24, 1817,[84] speaks of twice visiting a young woman who had killed her baby, and of her mental distress in the visits. On March 4, 1817, this memorandum occurs:[85] "I have just returned from a most melancholy visit to Newgate, where I have been, at the request of Elizabeth Fricker, who is to be executed to-morrow morning. Six men are also to be hanged—one of

[81] *Hints on the Advantages and Duties of Ladies' Committees Who Visit Prisons,* London, 1840, p. 6 et sqq.

[82] *Ibid.,* p. 14.

[83] Thomas Timpson, *Memoir of Elizabeth Fry,* pp. 79 and 328.

[84] Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 256.

[85] *Ibid.,* p. 263.

whom has a wife near her confinement who is also condemned and will leave eight children."

At this time there were about one hundred and eighty crimes for which the death sentence was the penalty, but while conviction was deemed necessary many of the sentences were not executed because of the horror of the judge, some juries which preferred to find "not guilty" to decreeing death, connivance with authorities, or some such plan.

The penalty for forgery was death and the very severity of the sentence prevented its execution.[86] By the Act of 41 George III, c. 39, the Bank of England had the power to select certain individuals to escape the death penalty if they pleaded "guilty to a minor count." Criminal law was a matter of horror to all humane individuals. In an article on "Newgate" of comparatively recent date,[87] this description occurs, "At every session criminals in scores were sentenced to death and the 'death sermon' in the prison chapel was an almost weekly occurrence. It was a favorite place for sightseers who used to attend the service and watch the poor wretches herded in the 'condemned pen' round a table on which was placed a black coffin. As late as 1833, sentence of death was passed upon a child of nine who poked a stick through a pane of glass in a shop front and stole paints worth two pence. This was house breaking and the penalty for housebreaking was death. After some delay, however, the sentence was commuted."

Sir Samuel Romilly presented bills again and again, hoping that the worst of the laws could be repealed, little by little.

He tells of meeting Mrs. Fry and discussing the subject with her,[88]—she told him of the great bitterness of the prisoners towards the Government—that they had said to her that "the Government was much more criminal than they, for it was about

---

[86]One of the law dictionaries (1820) says that had the law been carried into effect it would have meant one hundred executions annually from Old Bailey alone, and about four daily in the United Kingdom.

[87]E. Hooper, *The Daily Chronicle,* November 11, 1909.

[88]*Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly,* London, 1840, iii, p. 332.

to commit murder on the person of those who had only committed theft."

By this time Newgate had become a show,—a matter much to the distaste of Mrs. Fry but recognized as necessary until the public could be educated to the point of demanding reform. The case[89] of Harriet Skelton roused her greatly and received much public comment. She was a young, gentle girl with confiding manner and winning face who had, under the influence of her lover, passed forged notes and was under sentence of death. She was heavily chained, kept in a damp and dark cell, and gazed at by the curious crowd. Mrs. Fry was convinced that the girl had been given the opportunity by the Bank of England to plead "guilty on a minor count" and from some misunderstanding had not done so and was condemned. Appeal to authorities brought no results, so Mrs. Fry sent to the Duke of Gloucester whom she had not seen since the days of the scarlet riding habit, and he appealed in person to Lord Sidmouth (then Secretary of Home Affairs), but to no avail, and the girl was executed.

That capital punishment was no longer (1819) regarded serenely, was evident from the many publications that appeared at this time, including those of the Society for Diffusing Information on the Subject of Punishment by Death.[90] The records of the years between 1827 and 1830 in London, show ten hundred and fifty-eight sentences of death imposed, with fifty-five actual executions.[91]

The report of the work at Newgate, published in Sir T. F. Buxton's *Enquiry,* had awakened so much interest in the subject that letters of inquiry poured in to Mrs. Fry from all quarters and countries asking the methods of formation of a visiting association and reporting on the results of local activities of the same nature. They came from Nimes, Cleves, and Basle, from Turin, St. Petersburg, Geneva, Berlin, Paris, Montpelier, Zurich,

---

[89] *Memoirs,* i, p. 314.

[90] See *Life and Journal of Wm. Allen* (Partner of Owen), i, p. 104.

[91] E. G. Wakefield, *Facts Relating to Punishment of Death in the Metropolis,* London, 1832, p. 40-52.

Cologne, Dusseldorf, Frankfort, and other places in Holland, Russia, Germany, and France.[92]

The highest ranks of English and continental society manifested their interest in Elizabeth Fry and her work. The King of Prussia, who had met her upon one of her trips to the Continent, visited her to discuss proper regulations for care of prisons and lunatic asylums.[93] The royal family of England showed great interest,[94] and Lord Lansdowne addressed the Prince Regent under date of June 3, 1818, urging that the great success of Mrs. Fry, who had come like a "Genius of Good" into Newgate showed how much could be done were the mechanism adapted to the purpose of reform.[95]

Newgate work carried influence far beyond the boundaries of the prison, or even of the Islands. England at this time was using her Australian possessions for penal colonies and the transference of prisoners from gaols to the ships for transportation, was usually a scene of riot. Mrs. Fry persuaded the Governor of Newgate to transfer the prisoners in hackney coaches instead of in the open wagons customarily used, in which the women were exposed to inclement weather and the jeers and insults of the crowded streets, and she promised to accompany them herself. The first time this plan was carried out, she and a number of Friends accompanied one hundred and twenty-eight convicts and their numerous children, divided in classes of twelve and headed by a monitor,[96] to the ships at anchor in the Thames, and saw them settled for their trip of exile. Shortly after the report of the Newgate work had been published, a letter[97] reached Mrs. Fry from Paramatta, New South Wales. The chaplain, Samuel Marsden, explained that having heard of her work he wished to

---

[92]Thomas Timpson, *Memoir of Elizabeth Fry,* Chapter 6.

[93]*Memoirs,* ii, p. 425.

[94]Interview with Queen Charlotte, *Memoirs,* i, p. 314—With the Duchess of Kent and the Princess Victoria, ii, p. 126—With other members, ii, p. 128. Correspondence with the Princess Royal of Denmark, Susanna Corder, *Life of Elizabeth Fry,* p. 340.

[95]*Memoirs,* i, p. 325. [96]*Ibid.,* i, p. 319.

[97]Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 367 et sqq.

call her attention to conditions which destroyed any permanent success of her efforts so far as the transported convicts were concerned. For over twelve years he had been urging the Home Government to erect some sort of a shelter at the penal colony for the reception of women convicts on arrival and their maintenance until they were able to find employment.

For over twenty-five years the Government had been sending the women there, provided only with a very small allowance of money for food and, naturally, when employment was not to be found they turned to vice to supply the wherewithal to live. He assured Mrs. Fry that the Government knew this, since it had been the custom for many years when a ship load of female convicts docked, to permit convicts, settlers, and soldiers to go on board and take their choice, and while at the date of his letter (1819) that custom did not receive open sanction, the fact that the women landed without lodging or resources led to exactly the same result. The colony was a nursery for crime. Mrs. Fry never ceased her efforts until in 1820 the erection of a "factory" was begun at Paramatta and it was made possible for the women to live decent lives if they chose to do so.

One or more of the members of the Ladies' Association visited every convict ship for eighteen years, supplied the women with work, and arranged, if possible, for a school for the children on board.[98] The convict women patched quilts from pieces supplied from London and Manchester merchants and sold them in Rio Janeiro, where the vessels touched, or upon arrival at the colony, thus having another resource to provide funds to tide them over the early days of arrival. Through the Friends, arrangements were made to substitute women as caretakers of the convict women in the place of the sailors. These men had always had charge and entire freedom of communication, even during long weeks after the women were placed on board when adverse winds prevented prompt sailing. Results can be imagined.

The Association was also able to secure a diminution of

---

[98] *Memoirs*, i, p. 440.

the cruelties to which the convict women were subject. In 1822 Mrs. Pryor, one of the Friends most active in the work with women on the convict ships, complained[99] that prisoners from Lancaster arrived not merely handcuffed, but with heavy irons on their legs which occasioned swelling and sometimes serious inflammation. Mrs. Fry herself listed the names of twelve women who arrived on board the *Brothers* in 1823, handcuffed, and eleven others "iron hooped around their legs and arms and chained to each other,"—"not one able to get up to or down from the coach without dragging the whole number with her, and though some had children to carry they received no aid or alleviation to their suffering." [100]

All these things were brought to government attention by Mrs. Fry and she adds, "I am anxious that a few things that would greatly tend to the order and reformation of the women, and protect their little remaining virtue, should become established practice authorized by government and not dependent upon a few individuals whose life and health and everything else are so uncertain." By the members of the Association, the women were supplied with necessities to help them to maintain their self-respect and to permit them to land with some degree of decency in appearance.

The Government ceased the use of Botany Bay as a penal colony in 1840. The Paramatta "Factory," built through the efforts of Mrs. Fry, provided work for the women, and of it Mrs. Fry writes: [101] "We are pleased to learn that the factory of Paramatta has more than cleared its expenses in the last year, as the interest we feel in the welfare of the colonies induces us not only to desire the religious and moral improvement of the population at large, but in all our plans we wish to keep in view such a system as shall eventually prove most economical to the government as well as most beneficial to the colonial states." No one could accuse Mrs. Fry of hysterical sentimentality in regard to the prisoners.

[99] *Ibid.*, p. 439. [100] *Ibid.*, p. 444.
[101] Quoted in *Memoirs*, i, p. 451.

In a letter of July, 1820,[102] to Admiral Sir Thomas Byram Martin, she says, "Some of our prisons we think decidedly too comfortable and our great wish is that, by employment and instruction, with habits of cleanliness and order, the time of their (the women's) imprisonment may be a time of reformation, not of indulgence." In 1821 the British Ladies' Society for the Reformation of Female Prisoners was formed and was active up until 1878. At the same time, The Association for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders was much alive and in both of these Elizabeth Fry took expert part.

The report[103] of the British Ladies' Society for 1841, tells of shelters opened for discharged prisoners in London, Dublin, and Liverpool. Mrs. Fry herself was instrumental in establishing an institution at Chelsea for the destitute, vicious, and neglected little girls whose need she had first comprehended in her work in Newgate.[104] Her coworker in many lines of interest tells[105] of a night shelter for the homeless which she opened during the bitter winter of 1819-1820, an asylum on the edge of London. She secured a large empty warehouse and here the men were given straw and the women some bedding for the night, and at morning and evening were fed nutritious soup and abundance of bread. The average attendance was 205 nightly, the number reaching on one specially hard night 798.

Mrs. Fry's activities were not confined to London. With her brother, Joseph Gurney,[106] she made a tour of England and Scotland investigating the condition of prisons and making suggestions for their improvement. Her continental trips were filled with the same labors and she carried on a voluminous correspondence with the Venning brothers, of St. Petersburg,

---

[102] *Ibid.*, 448. [103] *Ibid.*, 464.

[104] *Memoirs*, i, p. 466.

[105] Thomas Timpson, *Memoir of Elizabeth Fry*, p. 62.

[106] *Notes on a Visit to Some of the Prisons of Scotland and the North of England in Company with Elizabeth Fry*, Edinburgh, 1819, by J. J. Gurney.

in regard to prisons and insane asylums.[107] When ill at Brighton one winter, she watched the coastguard in his lonesome march and life on the beach and soon busied herself in what was known as "the Coast Guards' Library Movement," and by 1836, about ten years later, 52,464 volumes of various kinds had been purchased by a committee and dispatched to coastguard stations.[108]

It is impossible to touch even lightly, in the scope of a limited chapter, upon all of the activities in which Mrs. Fry shared. On one of her trips to Brighton, she met Dr. Chalmers, the famous Glasgow divine who had taken one of the parishes of Glasgow, which cost the city over $7,000 annually in poor rates, crime, etc., and in four years had reduced its expense to $1,400 annually, accomplishing his results by forcing the idle and vicious to work and by giving adequate charitable relief through Friendly Visitors, Provident Societies, Sunday Schools, and other social agencies.[109]

So heartily did Mrs. Fry agree with Dr. Chalmers, that she furthered the establishment in Brighton of a District Visiting Society whose first annual report, issued in 1835, declared its objects to be, "the encouragement of industry and frugality among the poor, by visits at their own habitations; the relief of real distress, whether arising from sickness or other causes, and the prevention of mendicity and imposture." [110]

Meanwhile the effort toward reform in criminal law was growing more successful, and little by little and step by step, laws for capital punishment were repealed. Finally, by 1861, three crimes only are held by Parliament as deserving of the death decree. These three are murder, high treason, and piracy.

How much reformation Mrs. Fry really accomplished, no one can say; how permanent was the influence which she maintained over the convicts, it is impossible to judge; how much the immediate effects were due to her own personality and ex-

---

[107] *Memoirs,* i, pp. 381-390.

[108] "Report of Committee," quoted *Memoirs,* ii, p. 229.

[109] *Encyclopedia of Social Reform* (Bliss), New York, 1908, Dr. Chalmers.

[110] Quoted in *Memoirs,* i, p. 468.

quisite voice, noted by every one,[111] cannot be told. As Henry Grey Bennett said[112] in his article on Newgate abuses,—"charity may be like the benevolence of her heart, boundless,—she may remedy magisterial neglect, she may lessen all the evils attendant on this mode of confinement, but the disease is past her cure."

The subject of proper prison conditions was not original with her. The Quakers from the beginning of their religion were interested at various times in the problem. The Methodists in the days of the "Holy Club" had been active in prison visiting.[113] Her private influence, however, and her public appeals, led to distinct amelioration of the criminal code and of prison management in all Europe, and prevented much of the further production of criminals in institutions erected for the protection of society.

To women of the twentieth century the difficulties facing Elizabeth Fry would seem almost insurmountable. Her century was of the time when the public work of women was held in the greatest disfavor. Her home responsibilities with eleven children were tremendous, and her Journal,[114] as well as all other statements of her life, show the tender fidelity with which she met them.[115] She was not especially democratic in thought or training.[116]

[111]Letter from a Scotch woman who met her when in Scotland with her brother, "her musical voice seemed like that of a mother to her suffering child" (quoted by Timpson, *Memoir of E. F.*, p. 79),—and her brother wrote of her (*Ibid.*, p. 25), "her manner was remarkably adapted to her hearers. Well did she know how to find her way into the heart of a child at school, the sufferer on the sick bed, the corrupt and hardened criminal, and even the wild and wandering maniac."

[112] "Letter on the Abuses in Newgate," the *Pamphleteer*, 1818.

[113]See *Early Methodist Philanthropy*, E. M. North, New York, 1914, p. 7.

[114]The *Memoirs*, edited by her Daughters (1847), contains very extensive quotations from Mrs. Fry's Journal.

[115]The *Gentleman's Magazine* of September, 1820, contained a communication from "Crypta" which suggests familiar things, "the numerous family and large establishment of Mrs. Fry (who has been accused of neglecting her family) are conducted with judicious and active superintendence. She never appears distressed nor distracted, nor does her zeal in the holy cause of humanity ever lead her to infringe on those domestic duties which every female is called upon conscientiously to fulfill."

[116]Her Journal, quoted in *Memoirs*, i, p. 137, says, in speaking of ser-

The *Quarterly Review,* in a memorial[117] of Elizabeth Fry (1848), speaks of her "special vocation for her work—an enthusiasm regulated but not chilled by judgment. She was an example in simple dignity of demeanor, earnest piety and absolute disinterestedness, but she was the exception and not the rule. Whatever tends to draw woman from the soft, retiring, high, and lofty duties assigned to woman is high treason against the hopes of a nation."

Could Mrs. Fry have lived another half century, she would have believed more firmly than before in the prophecy of Dr. Proteus, which she often quoted to her daughters,[118] "Judging from the existing aspect of things, I believe the time is not far off when men will rank themselves more and more on either side of the arena of life; the mass of mankind which has looked on and scarcely heeded the battle, will diminish in number, though many may be mistaken and with the best intentions support the wrong, while others will uphold the right from selfish or worldly motives; yet indifference will cease to be the prevailing and oppressing sin—and a lively participation in feeling, if not in fact, with the subjects of the day will become general."

Mrs. Fry lived until 1845, active to the last in what she deemed "her Master's service."

Her motives in all her work are not far to seek. As she lay dying she said to her daughters,[119] "I can say but one thing—since my heart was first touched, at the age of seventeen, I believe I have never wakened from sleep, in sickness or in health, by day or by night, without my first waking thought being how best I might serve my Lord."

To a faith that can thus spend itself in tireless, unremitting efforts so to improve the worldly condition of those whose lines

---

vants, "we are not their familiars or equals in the things of this life, for we have reason to believe that difference in our stations is ordered by a wiser than ourselves."

[117] *Quarterly Review,* 1848.

[118] *Memoirs,* i, p. 402.

[119] *Introduction to Memoirs,* i, p. viii.

had not fallen into pleasant places that they too might share in the comforts of a living world and seize upon the hope of the promise of a world to come,—to such a faith,—all tribute must be paid.

2. The Antecedents of These Agents in Prison Reform

In this sketch of prison reform and the attempts to ameliorate prison conditions in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, we have no very extensive list of names to consider.

(a) The S. P. C. K. was an Anglican society but its work was entirely negligible in kind and amount so that nothing may be attributed definitely to that society.

(b) The Methodists were the first to make any real attempt to better the conditions existing, but their work was superficial and could not touch the roots of the misery. The fact that they were, as a group, without the franchise made their protests unheeded.

(c) The first great name is that of John Howard. Howard was a Dissenter of very strongly religious feeling. He ordinarily attended a Baptist chapel when there was one in the neighborhood, but was very broad in his views.[120] When he accepted the position of High Sheriff of Bedford, the Test Act was yet in force, but Howard took the position refusing to take the "Test" and strangely enough, escaped prosecution.[121]

(d) Elizabeth Fry was, of course, a Quaker—her work, like her entire life, a manifestation of her religion. In her, as has been said before, was the complete expression of Quaker belief,—the mystic sense of spiritual communion and the practical and philanthropic determination to better the world she lived in.

---

[120] John Aikin, *A View of the Life, Travels and Philanthropic Labors of the Late John Howard*, 1794, pp. 18-20.

[121] *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

VII

ANGLICAN PROMOTION OF EDUCATION FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE POOR IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY IN ENGLAND,—ITS ANTECEDENTS, ITS SETTING AND ITS INTERPRETATION.

Introduction

The history of movements for popular education in the early nineteenth century in England, is a story dominated by ecclesiastic and denominational purpose and rivalry, is a narrative which plainly exemplifies the "obstructionist" policy and influence of religious bigotry and intolerance. Yet, nevertheless, because of the developments, it may be classified as a "reform" or "reform producing" movement.

In order to understand the consistently inhibitory attitude of the Anglican Church toward government activity in popular education, it is essential to scan an Anglican movement of a previous era, and from that position to trace the phases through which the nineteenth century efforts of the Establishment were evolved.

The profligacy and licentiousness of the Restoration period were certain to produce reaction both within and without religious bodies. In 1678, this reaction took one form in the organization of the Religious Societies of London and Westminster and a little later (1691) in that of the Society for the Reformation of Manners. From these two types of association the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, one of the wealthiest and strongest societies of eighteenth century Anglicanism, was born.[1]

Social profligacy does not seem to have been confined at this

[1] Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge,* London, 1898, p. 8.

period to England of the Restoration, for Germany presents the struggle of the Pietists[2] eager to rouse dormant religious feeling, to produce some delineated form of struggle against the comprehensive immorality of the day, and to secure effective steps toward the promotion of general religious education.

Complete ignorance of secular knowledge on the part of the masses was an accepted and apparently approved condition. Secular knowledge seems to have been deemed the prerogative of the "higher classes," both on the Continent and in the Islands. The Bishop of Bath and Wells describes[3] his custom of questioning beggars, vagrants, and other human derelicts, and voices his conclusion (1680) that the only hope for the nation "lay in raising up a new generation who should be better taught in the principles of the Christian religion," but he makes no plea for general and diffused knowledge.

In Germany, at Halle, August Herman Francke had begun his work for the orphan children and the poor university students. It was customary on a certain day of the week, for the poor to come to the home of Professor Francke, just outside Halle, to beg, and he often asked the children in and questioned them.[4] Appalled by the ignorance exhibited, he sought to raise money for them to pay for their schooling, but soon found that they took the money and stayed away from school. With a capital of $3.50 which had been dropped in the poor box which he had placed by his door, he decided to start[5] a school where orphans whom he placed and boarded in families, could come for instruction. He had no resources and depended entirely upon what the benevolently inclined sent to him for his work, declaring that always, when he had need, the money came from some source.[6] The interest of citizens and even foreigners was aroused

[2]Cf. "Pietism," in Arthur C. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought before Kant*, New York, 1911, Chapter ix, p. 155.

[3]Quoted in Overton, *Life in the English Church*, London, 1885, p. 72.

[4]August Herman Francke, *Pietas Hallensis* or *Faith's Work Perfected*, edited and translated by W. L. Gage. New York, 1868, p. 18.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 23.

[6]*Ibid.*

and he decided that in order to prevent the loss of the acquisition of school instruction by outside influence, he would have to house and keep the children directly under his own eye. By 1696, two years after he had begun his work, his orphan children numbered thirty-six[7] and in 1698 he began the construction of a building to house the one hundred and seventy-two orphans, their teachers, (poor young students of the university who, if not provided with some means of earning their living, would not be able to continue their university work), and the necessary servants. All this time he was entirely dependent upon chance benevolence. His creation was in existence[8] in 1706, and then contained (a) a divinity school, (b) a teachers' seminary, (c) a free table for poor students of the university, (d) Latin schools for the well-to-do who wished more advanced education and who paid fees, (e) an Orphan House which contained bakehouse, brew house, slaughter house, dormitory, dining rooms, and schoolrooms, (f) a drug department used by the inhabitants of the city, giving the establishment an annual income of about $20,000, (g) a book store, (h) a publishing department, (i) a home for widows, and (j) an establishment for strolling beggars, and was still flourishing as a school in 1868.[9] One of the founders of the S. P. C. K., Dr. Horner, of All Saints, Oxford, had been educated there[10] (in Halle) but how much the Francke institution influenced the S. P. C. K. is impossible to say, although Dr. Francke was an enrolled member[11] within the first five years of the Society.

1. The Charity Schools of the Anglican Church

On March 8, 1698, a group of men, members of the Religious Societies and of the Society for the Reformation of Manners,

[7]August Herman Francke, *Pietas Hallensis* or *Faith's Work Perfected*, edited and translated by W. L. Gage. New York, 1868, p. 38.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. 82, et sqq.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 97.

[10]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 7.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 21.

met together and after some discussion, passed the following resolutions:[12] "Whereas the growth of vice and immorality is greatly owing to gross ignorance of the principles of the Christian Religion, we whose names are underwritten do agree to meet together as often as we can conveniently, to consult (under the conduct of Divine Providence and assistance) how we may be able by due and lawful methods to promote Christian knowledge." At the same time they incorporated the following points in the document of the original plan[13]—"1st, The Society shall consist of the Clergy of the chiefest note and of such Lay Gentlemen as are Eminent for their Work and Affection to Religion; 2nd, These persons shall be incorporated by Charter as the Royal Society or the Sons of the Clergy and be therefore empowered to meet and consult as often as there shall be occasion, upon the best means and methods of Promoting Religion and Learning in any part of His Majesty's Plantations abroad; 3rd, They (the members of the Society) shall proceed to provide Catechetical libraries in the smaller parishes of this kingdom, to enable the poor clergy to perform their duty of catechising according to the 39th canon,—and 4th. They shall proceed to set up Catechetical schools for the education of poor children in reading, writing, and more especially in the principles of the Christian religion."

There is no reason to believe that the Anglicans were the first to set up "Charity Schools," although their originator is uncertain. Colonel Colchester, one of the founders of the S. P. C. K., had promoted a charity school at his own expense in 1697, for in the Colchester Papers,[14] under date of May 16, 1697, there is a list of the "names of the children who cometh to the school on Col. Colchester's account, with the account of their entrance into books, the bookes they were in, and whether they have received almes, books or cloth and alsoe w^{t} books they are

---

[12] *Minutes of the Society* from 1698-1704, edited by Edmund McClure, London, 1888, pp. 1-10.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Quoted by Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years,* etc., p. 17.

now in, and alsoe they that are gon out as followeth (67 names)." Their books were a Primer, Testament, Bible, and Horn Book. Bishop Smalridge, in the Anniversary sermon of 1710, maintained that the Blue Coat School, belonging to the new Church in Westminster, erected in 1688, "being the first of its kind, may modestly challenge some sort of precedence by right of primogeniture." [15] and in the "Account of the Schools for 1733"[16] occurs the same statement that the "school first established was the Blue Coat School of St. Margaret's, Westminster, erected in 1688 for fifty boys."

Bishop Ken is said[17] to have set up schools for poor children long before 1688, but as they were country schools they may not have been considered. The numerous citations of plans for the overthrow or conversion of the Quakers in the earliest minutes of the S. P. C. K., suggest the possibility that Anglican activity in establishing Charity Schools was an effort to offset Quaker enterprises of the same nature, but there is no definite proof of this. The Quakers were active from the very first beginnings of their organization, in an earnest effort to promote general education. "In 1667 George Fox advocated the establishment of schools for poor boys and girls, and by 1671 there were fifteen Quaker schools. It may be justly claimed that a powerful Quaker influence lies behind the great English educational movements of the nineteenth century, and from the point of view of the history of education it is necessary to remember that this influence is closely related to the revival of elementary education (largely due to the Dissenters) which the Quakers carried right through the dark days of the eighteenth century." [18]

The Minutes of the S. P. C. K. bearing the date of March 8, 1698, declare, "that Dr. Bray and Colonel Colchester shall go to visit George Keith in order to see what he has accomplished

[15] *Anniversary Sermon for 1710.*

[16] *Account of the Charity Schools for 1733*, p. 21.

[17] W. L. Bowles, *Life of Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells*, London, 1831, ii, p. 98.

[18] *Cyclopedia of Education*, edited by Paul Monroe, J. E. G. Montmorency, "The Educational Influence of the Society of Friends."

toward the conversion and instruction of the Quakers that misguided people," and the two men report,[19] "that they have discovered George Keith and were pleased with the management of his design,—would procure him a recommendation for protection in his travels and with the Justices of the Peace." They would also "disperse Mr. Keith's narrative and Catechism[20] up and down the Kingdom among the Quakers for their better instruction and conversion." In October, 1700,[21] in a letter to a merchant in New England, a chosen correspondent of the Society, the Society announces that "another branch of our design is to endeavor to bring these poor, deluded people called Quakers to the true notions of Christianity," and in a letter[22] to Arch Deacon Booth at Eassington, near Durham, they declare "the Papists and Quakers who teach school will be easily suppressed by actions brought against them upon the statute of 1 Jac. 1, for 40li per diem which they forfeit for teaching school without license of the bishop or ordinary."

The *Minutes* of November 19, 1702,[23] report that "at Ashwell a Charity School has been erected for twenty-four boys and girls and that 'the Quakers are setting up a school for one hundred and fifty boys.'" Again, a letter was sent[24] to a Mr. Bedford of Bristol, "As soon as I communicated your letter to the Society they took care to have its proposals for bringing over the Quakers laid before my Lord Arch Bishop of Canterbury who very much approved of them. But his Grace thought fit to defer resolving anything about the matter because your city of Bristol is overrun with Quakers. The Society doth very much rejoice to hear that your city is so heartily engaged in setting up Charity Schools to which they wish all possible success."

---

[19]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 28.

[20]George Keith, *A Christian Catechism for the Instruction of Youth and Others against Quakerism*, London, 1699.

[21]*Minutes of the S. P. C. K.*, from 1698-1704, pp. 82-84.

[22]*Ibid.*, p. 84.

[23]*Ibid.*, p. 203.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 119.

The term "Charity School" was first used in the "Form of Subscription and the Instrument of Insurance" [25] adopted by the Society in March, 1699. The latter reads: "We whose names are underwritten, having agreed to promote the setting up of schools for the instruction of poor children in the Principles of Christianity in the several parishes where they are most wanted in and about the city of London, and having also to that purpose agreed to provide a sum of money to be employed by way of insurance for ye encouragement of such well disposed persons, as shall undertake to set up the same in such methods as we shall from time to time direct," do, etc.

By June, 1699, the first school is reported[26] in the "Hamlett of Poplar," and by October 26th of the same year, the first girls' school.

November saw the publication of the *First Circular Letter from the Society to its Clergy Correspondents in England and Wales,*[27] and it must be quoted at length. "The visible decay of religion in this Kingdom, with the Monstrous increase of Deism, Prophaneness and Vice, has excited the zeal of several persons of the best character in the cities of London and Westminster and other parts of the Nation, to associate themselves in order to consult together how to put a stop to so fatal an inundation. The cause thereof, they believe in great measure to arise from the barbarous ignorance observable among the common people, especially those of the poorer sort, and this to proceed from the want of due care in the education of the youth who, if early instructed in the Principles of the True Religion, seasoned with a knowledge of God and a just concern for their everlasting welfare, could not possibly (with the ordinary assistance of God's Good Spirit) degenerate into such vile practices as they now generally do. To remedy these evils, which cry aloud to Heaven for vengeance, they have agreed to use their best interests and endeavors to incline the hearts of the generous and well disposed

[25] *Minutes of the S. P. C. K.* from 1698-1704, p. 36.
[26] *Minutes,* 1698-1704, p. 26.
[27] *Ibid.,* p. 36.

persons to contribute toward the erecting of schools in these cities and the parts adjacent, for the instruction of such poor children in Reading, Writing, and in the Catechism, whose Parents or Relations are not able to afford them the ordinary means of Education, and as they look upon this as the most effectual method to train up the poorer sort in sobriety and ye knowledge of Christian principles, so they assure themselves that the good effects which may be wrought thereby will prove a powerful argument to engage others in better circumstances to make so necessary a provision for their children. The success of this undertaking (whereby the education of above two thousand poor children is already taken care of) encourages them to hope that if the like industry and observation were observed in other parts of this kingdom, the children and youth might be universally well principled and the growing generation make a conscience of learning God: and these hopes have induced them to use the utmost endeavors to prevail with all pious and well inclined Christians in ye several parts of ye nation to joyn their hearts and purses in advancing to perfection, so excellent and glorious a work."

By 1704[28] there were fifty-four charity schools in and about London and Westminster with 2,131 children under instruction, the money expended having been in excess of 3,206 pounds annually. The schools were supported by voluntary contributions, effigies of children flanked by poor boxes being customary sights in front of the charity schools. If funds ran low, the rector preached a sermon calling attention to the needs of the school and asking for donations. As time passed, very valuable property was often left by will for the support of a certain school or schools, and the findings concerning the use of those funds made one of the most bitter scandals of the second and third decades of the nineteenth century. For two years, members of the Society supervised the schools themselves, but in 1700, an

---

[28]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 140.

"Inspector of all the Schools of London and Westminster" was appointed[29] at a salary of twenty pounds a year.

In 1704[30] occurred the first Anniversary Sermon. The year previous, one of the members had made the motion[31] "that the poor children in Charity schools might walk in procession once a year to some church and hear a sermon, and it was recommended to the agents to discourse upon this matter to the trustees." Delays of one kind and another occurred, however, and the first Anniversary sermon was preached on June 8, 1704, before two thousand poor children, their masters and mistresses and the public.

In Strype's edition of Stow's *London*, he says,[32] "It was a wondrous, surprising as well as a pleasing sight that happened June 8, 1704, when all the boys and girls maintained at these schools walked in their habits, two by two, with their masters and mistresses, some from Westminster and some through London, and all meeting at St. Andrew's, Holborn, where a seasonable sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Richard Willis, Dean of Lincoln, the children being placed in the galleries. They were about two thousand, and each had a small piece of paper fastened to their breasts or sleeves, showing to what parish they belonged and a printed paper in their hands giving an account of these schools, the sum whereof was that these poor children were all taught, the boys reading, writing, and casting of accounts, the girls sewing and working, and also all are diligently instructed in the Catechism in which they are publicly examined in the Churches on the Lord's day after the evening sermon."

From 1704 to 1737 the annual service of the Charity schools was held at St. Sepulchre's, from that date to 1781 at Christ Church, and from 1781 to 1877 (when they ceased to be held because of lack of funds) in St. Paul's Cathedral.[33] These

[29]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 143.

[30]*Minutes of the Society*—1698-1704, p. 220.

[31]*Minutes*, 1698 to 1704, p. 220.

[32]Quoted by Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years*, etc., p. 147.

[33]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years*, etc., p. 148.

sermons[34] became more or less of a popular event, the general public, including the nobility and members of the royal family, often attending.

Of this Steele wrote in 1712, "I was last Sunday highly transported at our parish church (a local service was held annually also) the gentleman in the pulpit moved pleadingly in behalf of the poor children and they for themselves, much more forcibly by singing a hymn; and I had the happiness to be a contributor to this little institution of innocents and I am sure I never disposed of money more to my satisfaction and advantage." [35] In previous numbers[36] he had urged greater interest in and support of the charity schools, especially those of the parish of St. Bride's, where he lived.

Occasionally, the charity school services were given in London on the occasion of some unusual event. In 1713, in public Thanksgiving for the peace of Utrecht, four thousand children were placed on a stand six hundred feet long, erected in the Strand in full view of the Houses of Parliament,[37] and in 1714 at the accession of George the First, the children were similarly placed and sang as the King went by. Of the occasion of 1713 Addison makes mention,[38] "Never did a more full and unspotted chorus of human creatures join together in a hymn of devotion. I have always looked on this institution of Charity schools as the glory of the age we live in and the most proper means that can be made use of, to recover it out of its present degeneracy and depravation of manners."

Of the occasion of 1714, the secretary of the King, Wm. Chamberlayne, reported that the Prince had been so pleased with

---

[34]Each Anniversary sermon was published with an account of the schools for the previous year and as each successive number contains a recapitulation of previous conditions, the series forms an excellent and indubitable source of information.

[35]*Spectator,* No. 430.

[36]*Ibid.,* Nos. 294 and 380.

[37]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years,* etc., p. 147.

[38]The *Guardian,* No. 105, July 11, 1713.

the sight that he had said,[39] "that the charity children were one of the finest sights he had ever seen in his life and that he wished his own children had been with him to have seen them at the same time."

The Minutes of the Society for 1713 (October) record the fact that the demonstration had so pleased certain provincial visitors that they immediately established schools upon their return home. In 1714 both Alexander of Russia and the King of Prussia, with Marshal Blücher and General Platoff, were present, and were delighted with the singing of *Old Hundred* by the children, and in 1836 Victoria and the Duchess of Kent were guests at the Anniversary service.

The average number of children present at one of these services was forty-five hundred, out of a congregation of twelve thousand. In a rather naive description, Dr. Wm. Vincent, in his *Considerations on Parochial Music,* published in 1787, says,[40] "The union of five thousand trebles raises admiration and astonishment. It is a choir impossible to collect by any other means. Add to this, a variety of other ideas go to make up the whole of our delight. Compassion, benevolence, and Christian charity dilate the heart, considerations of public utility engage the attention, reflections upon the probable advantages accruing to so many poor human creatures rescued from total ignorance, steal upon the mind and the aggregate of these several feelings contribute to render it one of the most heart-moving spectacles exhibited in this or any other country."

In 1701 a charter was obtained[41] by the society, "whereby the subscribing members of this Society, with others distinguished in Church and State, were incorporated for the better carrying on of that branch which related to the Plantations, Colonies, and Factories beyond the seas belonging to the Kingdom of

---

[39]Quoted in Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years,* etc., p. 148.

[40]*Ibid.,* p. 149.

[41]*Account of the S. P. C. K. for 1733,* p. 2. (Published with the Anniversary sermon of that year.)

England; from which time that excellent work has by the divine blessing been very successfully carried on by the corporation."

It must not be forgotten that this society was distinctly and finally ecclesiastic in its nature and that every move in connection with its work was determined from that angle. It typifies the eighteenth century conception of "charity" as well—a movement on the part of the superior to uplift the inferior, keeping him infallibly mindful of his great benefits and the beautifully Christian nature of his benefactor, whose continued wealth and prosperity he must earnestly desire and, where possible, promote, whatever the personal cost.

At the risk of tediousness, it is essential to go into some length and detail concerning early reports, plans, and sermons of the society, since from no other source can evidence so indubitable be secured.

The matter of the selection of the master of the charity school was an affair of ecclesiastic importance and therefore carefully fenced by the Society. The necessary qualifications were enumerated[42] at length. "He must be a communicant member of the Church of England, of sober life and conversation and not under twenty-five years of age. A master of meek temper and humble behavior, that hath good government of himself and his passions, must be selected. He must understand well, the grounds and principles of the Christian religion and be able to give a good account thereof to the Minister of the Parish or Ordinary on examination. He must be able to write a good hand and understand the grounds of arithmetic: he must, of course, be one who keeps good order in his own family and who is approved by the Minister of the Parish."

No leeway was allowed[43] for possible indiscretions in management,—"(1) The master shall constantly attend to his proper business in the school during the hours appointed for teaching,—

---

[42] *Account of the Method by which Charity Schools have been Erected and Managed,* 1708, p. 4.

[43] *Ibid.,* p. 5.

viz. from 7 to 11 A. M. and from 1 to 5 P. M. the summer half year, and from 8 to 11 A. M. and 1 to 4 P. M. the winter half year. (2) To the end, the chief design of this school, which is the education of poor children in the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion as professed and taught in the Church of England, may be the better promoted, the master shall make it his chief business to instruct the children in the Church Catechism which he shall teach them to pronounce distinctly and plainly, and then in order to practice, shall explain it to the meanest capacity by some good exposition approved by the Minister, and this shall be done constantly twice a week. (3) Then, the 'Whole Duty of Man' (poor babies, seven to twelve years in age) shall discourage and correct the beginnings of vice, especially lying, stealing, swearing, cursing, taking God's name in vain, and the prophanation of the Lord's day. And in general, the master shall follow the direction of the Minister. (4) The master shall teach them the true spelling of words and distinction of syllables. (5) As soon as the boys can read competently well, the master shall teach them to write a fair legible hand, with the grounds for arithmetic, to fit them for service or apprentices. (6) The master shall bring the children to Church twice every Lord's day and holy day. (7) The master shall use prayers morning and evening in the school and shall teach the children to pray at home and to use grace before and after meat (there was an established form of prayers for the "Charity Schools"). (8) The master shall keep a record of attendance, absence, tardiness, etc. (including the cheerful record kept for each child and known as a 'monthly fault bill,' to be shown each month to the trustees)."

The *Charity* nature of the school was jealously maintained. "This school being only designed for the benefit of such children whose parents and friends are not able to give them learning, the Master shall not receive any money of the children's friends at their entry or breaking up or upon any other pretense whatsoever. Nor shall the Master teach any other besides the poor children of this school, but shall content himself with his salary upon pain of forfeiting his place."

In some small villages "payment by results" was common.[44] As soon as the child could name and distinguish all the letters in the alphabet the master received 2s. 6d.,—when he could spell well another 2s. 6d. was paid, and when he could read well and say the Church Catechism 5s. was paid. Thus, a child could be taught to read (results guaranteed) for 10s.

The brand of charity, too, was to be carefully fixed. "The children shall wear their caps, bands, cloths, and other marks of distinction every day, whereby the trustees and benefactors may know them and see what their behavior is abroad."

The parents also are regulated[45] most minutely. "(1) The children are to be kept at home for no cause whatsoever except sickness; (2) the parents must send their children cleaned, washed, and combed; (3) the parents shall correct their children for such faults as they commit at home or else shall report them to the master; (4) parents shall freely submit their children to undergo the discipline of the school when guilty of any faults and shall forbear coming thither on such occasions, so that the children may not be countenanced in their faults nor the master discouraged in his duty;[46] (5) parents should have prayers morning and evening, frequently hear the Catechism repeated, etc., that they themselves, as well as their children, may be im-

---

[44]Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 142.

[45]*Account of the Charity Schools for 1708*, p. 7.

[46]The story of the cruelties practised by schoolmasters of even the highly endowed and public schools, upon their pupils in the eighteenth century, does not make pleasant reading. Dr. Johnson says (Birckbeck Edition, ii, p. 157), in discussing with Boswell, a suit against a Scotch schoolmaster, brought by the parents of a boy whom he had beaten, "You must show that a schoolmaster has a prescriptive right to beat and that an action of assault and battery cannot be submitted against him unless there is evidence of some great excess, some barbarity. This man has maimed (!) none of his boys. In our schools in England many boys have been maimed but I never heard of an action against the schoolmaster on that account."

Steele, in the *Spectator* (157), remarks, "I would not be supposed to have said that our learned of either robe who have been whipped at school are not still men of noble and liberal minds, but I am sure that they would have been much more so than they are had they never suffered the infamy."

proved; (6) if parents do not observe the said orders the children shall be dismissed the school and shall forfeit their school clothes."

Children were eligible between the years of seven and twelve, each subscriber having the privilege of nominating children for the school and the trustees taking turns in the selection of those to be admitted.

Funds for the support of these schools were raised by subscription and when the amount was insufficient for schooling and clothes, the clergyman had the privilege of preaching a monthly, quarterly, or yearly sermon to make up the deficiency through exhortation.

One of the schools[47] had, by this date, added some manual work (1708), wool spinning, making and mending of shoes, sewing and knitting, and the "income of the charity and their earnings was sufficient to find them in diet, lodging, and all other necessaries, with an overplus of some small matter toward a stock which is much wanted to put more of the said children out apprentices and to find them some small matter (after diligent and faithful service) to begin with in the world as is much to be wished if it please God this charity do so far prosper."

The books[48] for the use of the master and those for the

[47] *Acct. of 1708*, p. 9. (St. Margaret's, Westminster.)

[48] Catalogue in Account of Schools in 1712, pp. 70-71. From year to year additions were made, but no change in type.

For the Master

1. A Quarto Bible with a Chronological Table.
2. Some Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures.
3. Bishop Fell's Paraphrase upon St. Paul's Epistles.
4. Bishop Patrick's, Search the Scriptures.
5. Lowth: Directions for the Profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures.
6. Plain Directions for Reading the Holy Bible.
7. Common Prayer Book with Singing Psalms.
8. Comber, On the Common Prayer.
9. Some Book of Psalmody.
10. Mr. Nelson's Companion for the Festivals and Facts of the Church of England.
11. Bishop Ken, Exposition of the Church Catechism.
12. Bishop Salisbury's Exposition of the Church Catechism.

children themselves, are distinct evidences of the nature of the "charity." At this date (1708) there were,[49] in London and

13. Dr. Bray, Catechetical Institution and Baptismal Covenant.
14. Bishop Beveridge, On Public Prayer and Frequent Communion.
15. Mr. Nelson, On the Sacrament.
16. Rawlet, Sacramental Covenanting with Christ.
17. Prayers Before, At, and After Sacrament.
18. The Whole Duty of Man.
19. Hammond, Practical Catechism.
20. Oftervald, Grounds and Principles of the Christian Religion.
21. Dr. Lucas, Practical Christianity.
22. Arndt, True Christianity.
23. Bishop Taylor, Holy Living and Dying.
24. Life of God in the Soul of Man.
25. Worthington, Great Duty of Self Resignation to the Divine Will.
26. Bishop Hopkins, Great Duty of Mortification.
27. Lord Chief Justice Hale, Contemplations, Moral and Divine.
28. Dr. Worthington, Thomas à Kempis.
29. Jenks, Devotions.
30. Life of James Bonnell, Esq.
31. Grotius, Of the Truth of the Christian Religion.
32. Oftervald, Causes of the Present Corruption of Christians.
33. Reflections on Man's Prejudices against Religion.
34. An Essay upon True Knowledge and Sound Judgment in Religion.
35. Monro, Just Measures of the Pious Institutions of Youth.
36. Dr. Talbot, The Christian Schoolmaster.
37. The Christian Education of Children.
38. Disney, First and Second Essay Concerning the Execution of Certain Laws against Immorality and Prophaneness.
39. A Method of Instruction of Children and Youth.

For the Children

1. A Bible, Testament and Common Prayer Book.
2. The Church Catechism (Broke into Short Questions).
3. Lewis, Exposition of the Church Catechism.
4. Worthington, Scripture Catechism.
5. The First Principles of Practical Christianity.
6. Dr. Woodward, Short Catechism with an Explanation of Divers Hard Words.
7. New Method of Catechizing.
8. The Whole Duty of Man.
9. The Anatomy of Orthography.
10. An Exercise against Lying.
11. The Way of Living in a Method and by Rule.

[49] *Account of the Charity Schools*, 1708, p. 35.

Westminster, and "in ten miles round about," seventy-four schools with three thousand and eight children under instruction, and in all England[50] one hundred and ninety-eight schools.

The Anniversary Sermon of 1708 defines the "nature of this charity." "It is purely religious (ecclesiastical (!)), the whole aim being to give to those persons to whom it is extended a just account of the Being and Providence of God and of the End and Duty of Man and to strengthen and confirm them in the belief and love and practice of what they are taught. And the methods here taken are the most proper and effectual for that purpose." Dr. Moss's conceptions of the possibilities attainable to the children through the agency of these schools are comprehensive,[51]—"What a happy state must they be in who, when they come to take upon them the government of themselves, have the pleasure to find their understandings replenished with proper knowledge, their passions tractable and obedient to reason, and the whole state of their souls regular and orderly. What an ease and comfort must it be to them to perceive that all things have been so well managed and conducted for them during their minority that they have nothing more to do but go on in the path which lies plain before them without either turning to the right or the left." "Idleness, want (desire) and ill examples are three main springs of corruption," he assures the children, "and that is particularly provided for in the way of education we are now considering. Were poor children never so well instructed in the saving truths of the Gospel, yet the meanness of their condition will necessitate them to be careful about so many other things that they will have but little leisure and less inclination to mind the one thing needful; though they understand their duty to God and their neighbor, yet when they have not food convenient for them, when their appetites are craving and the demands of Nature peremptory, they will be tempted to steal and take the name of God in vain: when poverty comes upon them like an

[50] *Account of the Charity Schools,* 1708, p. 36.

[51] *Anniversary Sermon of the Charity Schools,* delivered May 27, 1708, by Robert Moss, Chaplain to the Queen.

armed man, it must be no ordinary degree of virtue that can enable them to hold fast their integrity and not part with their innocence for a morsel of bread." The children are exhorted[52] to understand their great advantage,—"great is the benefit of such an education as this, when children are not only bred up for several years under the eye and discretion of discreet persons who are always showing them what is good and are never seen to depart from their own lessons: but by learning the same rules and practising the same duties altogether, their minds are more easily bent the same way and they are by a mutual emulation, excited not only to imitate but to excel one another."

Dr. Moss had no indecision[53] in his opinions concerning the purposes of the existence of the poor,—"If we look into the works of the Most High, there are two against two, the Rich vs. the Poor, and Prosperity vs. Adversity, and we must acknowledge things to be well and wisely ordered both on a natural and a moral account." (The logical and expected point of view!) "The disparity in circumstance between man and man, which God in wisdom hath appointed, serves to induce such as are mean and needy, willingly to resign the power to them who already enjoy the advantages of birth and fortune." (What a terrific shock the French Revolution would have given this Chaplain of the Queen.) "Poverty is the proper state to try men's faith, patience and resignation, to exercise their humility and moderation. The poor owe the rich, modest deference and humble deportment as towards those whom Almighty God hath placed in a superior station,—there is an obligation upon those of inferior degree to keep their rank and observe decorum in it, and not to look up with an evil and an envious eye upon those above them, much less to behave themselves rudely and disrespectfully toward them, or turn refractory or contumacious—because such disorderly behavior would be an act of disobedience toward God. The poor also owe the rich honesty and diligence in their vocation and business. For as it hath not seemed good

[52] *Anniversary Sermon of 1708*, pp. 14 and 15.
[53] *Ibid.*, 4-6.

to God their Maker, to bestow much plenty upon them, they ought to be content with his allowance and accept it upon the terms that he has given it to them, even the sweat of their own brows. They must not dare to set up for their own carvers by filching and stealing or any base or dishonest way of livelihood, they must not give themselves up to idleness nor betake themselves to the wicked trade of begging which is indeed *to rob their wealthier neighbors and the public of the use of those hands which were made for labor and ought to be so employed.*" [54] One is relieved to find that "the rich owe the poor humanity, justice (in paying the money which the poor have earned) and charity." Part of a hymn sung by the children at the service of 1712 expresses[55] the same spirit.

While these extracts are quoted from sermons and services dating to the earlier history of the schools, they are quite typical of the entire movement and might have been delivered at the beginning of the nineteenth century quite as well.

According to the historians of the S. P. C. K., the list[56] of membership enrolled[57] all lines of thought within the Church, High Churchmen, Latitudinarians, and Non-Jurors.

It seems almost superfluous to add, that when in 1729, the religious meetings at Oxford developed into the movement headed

---

[54] *Anniversary Sermon of 1708* (Dr. Moss), p. 17.

[55] *Account of the Charity Schools*, 1712, p. 73.

> "With what resembling care and love
> Both worlds for us appear.
> Our blessed guardians, those above,—
> Our benefactors, here."

[56] Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 127.

[57] Members were taken into the society only upon recommendation of another member, who filled out the following blank, "We, the underwritten, do recommend . . . to be a subscribing member of the S. P. C. K. and do verily believe that he is well affected to His Majesty, King George, and to his government and to the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established—of a sober and religious life and conversation and of an humble, peaceable, and charitable disposition." *Account of 1746*, p. 11.

by Wesley and Whitefield, the S. P. C. K. opposed[58] the innovations and frowned upon the unseemliness of enthusiasm.

This attitude toward zeal on the part of any churchman is explicable because of the "Jacobitist" sentiment which had caused much difficulty within the Church. She could not afford to permit either the high dignitary or the small vicar, much less the petty schoolmaster, to indulge in any activity which could not be demonstrated as strictly and entirely "safe."

On October 3, 1716, the masters of Adele Hill, St. Anne Aldersgate, and St. Anne Westminster schools were pronounced[59] "unfit to be teachers for the disaffection to His Majesty, King George, which was plainly made to appear against them." The plot must have been an attempt to spread disaffection through the four thousand children (from seven to twelve years of age) who were under their care. From that date each annual report of the Society contains the following statement,[60] "And knowing that it is of the highest importance to the welfare of Charity schools to remove all occasion of complaint against them as nurseries of disaffection to the Government,—His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, having heard some complaints against the conduct of certain teachers of these schools, did in 1716 write a letter to the trustees of the schools in and about London earnestly exhorting them to animadvert upon all, whether either children or teachers, who either appear or suffer them to appear, at any time in public to affront the government and bear a part in those tumults and riots which are so great a scandal as well as prejudice to the good order and peace of the realm. And likewise if there be any Catechisms or institutions taught in any of these schools that meddle with party or political principles, that they ought immediately to be thrown aside as pernicious to

[58] Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years,* etc., p. 127. (Both the authors of this "History" are members of the S. P. C. K. and former officers of the organization.)

[59] *St. James Evening Post,* October 6 and 9, 1716, and *Weekly Journal,* October 13, 1716, quoted by Chas. Hole, *A Manual of English Church History,* London, 1910, p. 343.

[60] Each Annual Account of the Society from 1716.

the original design of those pious nurseries. That some time after, His Grace recommended to the Trustees of the Charity Schools to require all masters and mistresses under their direction, not only to take the oaths to the government before their admission, but at the time of their admission to subscribe to some such solemn promise or declaration as the following,—that they do heartily acknowledge His Majesty King George to be the only lawful and rightful King of these realms, and will to the utmost of their power educate the children committed to their charge in a true sense of their duty to him as such, that they will not by any words or actions do anything whereby to lessen their esteem of or their obedience to the present government. That upon all public days when their children may be likely to appear amongst any disorderly persons, they will do their best to keep them in and severely punish them if they shall hear of their running into any tumults or public meetings, contrary to the good order of such schools and scholars."

Naturally, the Church never ceased to fear the influence of the Dissenters, especially in educational lines. The last disgraceful statute of its kind on the books was that passed[61] in February, 1714, known as the "Schism Act." Its preamble declared that, "Whereas, notwithstanding the said Act (ii Car. ii, c. 4) sundry Papists and other persons dissenting from the Church of England have taken upon them to instruct and teach youth as tutors or schoolmasters and have for such purpose openly set up schools and seminaries whereby, if due and speedy remedy be not had, great danger might ensue to this Church," etc. The Act provided that "no person in Great Britain should keep any public or private school or act as tutor that has not first subscribed to the Declaration and obtained a license from the diocesan." The Act never seems to have been enforced and was repealed in 1719,[62] and in 1779 by another measure,[63] "No dissenting minister shall be prosecuted for teaching, provided

[61] *12 Anne, Stat. 2*, c. 7.
[62] *5 George I*, c. 4, s. 1.
[63] *19 George III*, c. 44.

(Sec. 3) that no Dissenter shall obtain a foundation in any endowed property unless it shall have been left for the immediate use and benefit of Protestant Dissenters."

The Charity Schools were not universally admired even in their own day. Mandeville includes in his 1723 edition of his *Fable of the Bees,* a chapter on Charity Schools to which he strenuously and amusingly objects. Part of his objections sound almost as though they had emanated from a High Churchman himself, "Servants are endeavoring to be upon level with masters and mistresses. They not only seem solicitous to abolish the low dignity of their condition, but have already considerably raised it in the common estimation from the original meanness which the public welfare requires it should always remain in. I do not say that these are altogether owing to the Charity Schools." [64] Again "abundance of hard and dirty labor is to be complied with: where shall we find a better nursery for these necessities than the children of the poor. There is an unreasonable vein of petty reverence for the poor that runs through most multitudes, arising from a mixture of folly, pity, and superstition." [65] He seems[66] astonishingly shrewd, if exaggeratedly so, "if they would agree to pull off the mask, we should soon discover that whatever they pretend to, they aim at nothing so much in charity schools as to strengthen their party, and that the great sticklers for the Church,—by educating children in the principles of religion, mean, inspiring them with a superlative veneration for the clergy of the Church of England and a strong aversion and immortal animosity against all that dissent from it,"—"the grand assertions of liberty likewise, speak up loudly for charity schools, but what they expect from them has no relation to religion or morality. They only look upon them as the proper means to destroy the power of the priests over the laity. Reading and writing increase knowledge, and the more men know the better

---

[64] Bernard de Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees,* London, 1772, vol. 1, p. 231.

[65] *Ibid.,* 235.

[66] *Ibid.,* p. 234.

they can judge from themselves and they imagine that if knowledge could be rendered universal, people could not be priest-rid, which is the thing they fear the most."

The arguments expressed, that charity schools tended to "raise" the lower classes from the position where divine Providence had placed them, the S. P. C. K. refuted with care. The account of 1711 urges the education of the poor since "piety, virtue, and an honest way of living are not only of absolute necessity to their happiness here and hereafter, but are necessary also to the security and ease of all other persons whatsoever, inasmuch as there is no body, but may stand in need of their help or be liable to receive injuries from them." By 1733,[67] the Society had gathered and disseminated much information in its schools, about workhouses, "that the children might have such an education as would make them better servants and apprentices and in all respects more useful to their country." As early as 1712, according to the same account,[68] the society urges that the trustees apprentice the children to husbandry, "lest there may be a want of servants in husbandry," and by 1719 the public is assured[69] that effort is being made to instruct the children in "husbandry, sewing, knitting, spinning, and other useful employments,—and thus the objection against charity schools will be obviated, that they tend to take poor children off from those servile offices which are necessary in all communities, and for which the wise Governor of the world has by his providence designed them." The sermon[70] of 1735 breathes the same spirit, "their (the children's) constant lesson is humility and lowliness of mind and their dress is such as naturally reminds them that they live upon the alms of others, which is the lowest condition of life."

In 1746, the trustees of St. Andrews, Holborn, gave notice

---

[67] *Account of 1733*, p. 6.
[68] *Ibid.*, Appendix.
[69] *Ibid.*
[70] *Anniversary Sermon*, 1735, p. 20.

to gardeners and farmers that they would apprentice the children, giving a bonus of five pounds with each boy and three pounds with each girl.[71]

Until nearly the end of the century the schools increased steadily. In 1725[72] there were 132 schools in London with 11,230 children in them, while in the Islands there were 1,597 schools with 32,810 pupils.

By 1750[73] the number of schools in the Islands and Iceland had grown to 1,952 and 47,153 children were under the masters.

The Anniversary sermon[74] of that year is particularly naive and edifying in its analysis of the pleasure which arises from conferring benefits on the poor and the wisdom of so doing. It was the work of Edward Yardley, Arch Deacon of Cardigan.

"The giver receives great pleasure from the giving of benefits when he reflects within himself how happy he is in having a tender sense of the wants of others. The giving to others gives us credit and interest in the world,—it lays mankind under an obligation to us, for whoever receives favors from us is bound by the strictest gratitude to make such return as he can, occasionally to assist us in our wants if he should be able, or at the least to make an acknowledgment of thanks, to wish us well and to pray for us. And besides, those who have not in their own persons been beholden to us, if they have any fellow feeling of the necessity which others have been under and the relief they have met with, will gratefully own the Good Man's humanity and will think themselves bound to show all manner of kindness and friendship to him. They will esteem him as a benefactor to the nature which they partake of and will always rejoice at his well being, peace, and prosperity. Moreover, the state of this world at best is fickle and uncertain, and *it is the greatest prudence to make ourselves friends of the mammon of un-*

---

[71] *Account of 1746*, p. 37.
[72] *Account of the Charity Schools for 1725*, p. 43.
[73] *Account of 1750*, p. 17.
[74] *Anniversary Sermon for 1750.*

righteousness that if the wheel which is always turning should throw us lower, we may meet with some who have been indebted to our bounty and are now, perhaps, as able as they are willing to lend their grateful hands toward raising us up." "Again, while we employ our time, our pains, and our treasure in acts of charity and generosity, what a superiority doth it give us over the rest of the world. They that are benefactors exercise authority as it were, over all those whom they oblige. The munificent man is exalted by his generosity and placed in a high and noble station,—nay, the more he gives, the higher he rises, and his character increases in proportion to the extent of his munificence." What wonder that wealthy Anglicans rallied gladly in support of the Charity Schools?

It must not be supposed that the Dissenters had established no charity schools,—they had been quite as active[75] as the Anglicans, and however limited and utterly inadequate the schools of both Dissenters and Anglicans appear in the light of twentieth century education, they, with the Sunday Schools,[76] laid the foundations for the elementary educational systems of England.[77]

The year 1775[78] saw 157 Anglican Charity Schools in London, with 5,802 children, while in England and Wales there were 1,320 schools, containing 23,420 pupils. By 1800,[79] the number of London schools had risen to 179 with 7,108 children.

The next decade,[80] however, saw an appreciable drop, the London schools numbering 116, with 5,022 pupils. This loss was undoubtedly due to the development of the Lancaster non-sectarian system which was growing much in favor. The Church

---

[75]Irene Parker, *Dissenting Academies*, Cambridge, 1914, and E. M. North, *Early Methodist Philanthropy*, New York, 1914, give some information on this field. For earlier sources, Isaac Watts has a pamphlet, London, 1728. See also, Alfred Plimmer, *The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1910.

[76]See note on Sunday Schools.

[77]J. E. G. Montmorency, *Cyclopedia of Education.*

[78]*Account of the Charity School for 1775*, p. 57.

[79]*Account of 1800*, p. 110.

[80]*Account of 1810*, p. 127.

became thoroughly alarmed, gathered her resources, rallied to the struggle, and began her unwearying effort to prevent all types of popular education except those under her own inefficient auspices.

This early nineteenth century controversy raged around two men, Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker, and Andrew Bell, an Anglican. Viewed with modern eyes, the extent and acrimony of the disputes seems ludicrous,—a tempest in a tea pot—but in reality it was a contention which, petty in itself, gave rise to great popular interest in the subject of popular education and consequent effective steps, however halting and retarded, toward freeing the people from the chains of intellectual bondage welded by religious domination.

2. The Lancaster-Bell Controversy

Joseph Lancaster[81] was a young Quaker who early in life (he was born in 1778) became intensely interested in the teaching of poor children who lived in the neighborhood of his home in Southwark. His school there was opened in 1798[82] and as he was possessed of a winning personality, abounding self-confidence, great capacity for managing children, much enthusiasm, and love of his work, and ingenuity in devising methods, his school grew enormously and attracted the attention of many people of all classes. The fact, too, that Lancaster was always a poor man himself and consequently had to depend upon public interest to maintain his school, kept it much, through solicitation[83] for funds, in the public eye.

Hampered by the need of economy, he hit upon the pupil

---

[81] The best biography of Lancaster is that by David Salmon, London, 1904.

[82] *Account of the progress of Joseph Lancaster's Plan from 1798 to 1811*, p. 1.

[83] His biographer (Salmon) describes him as a "skillful, persistent and unblushing beggar, joined to a sect always famous for its liberal and unostentatious charities." Lancaster must have been an early member of the group who have been plainly, if somewhat harshly, described, as "an establishment of beggars to reduce beggary."

teacher or monitorial system[84] and from this simple device produced a complicated machinery of school teaching and management. A monitor (a pupil who was especially capable, usually of the class above the one which he taught or managed)[85] attended to practically every move that was made in the school.

"The master," says[86] Lancaster, "should be a silent bystander and inspector. What a master says, should be done, but if he teaches on this system (the Lancastrian method) he will find the authority is not personal,—that when the pupils as well as the school master understand how to act and to learn on this system, the system's, not the master's, vague, discretionary, uncertain judgment will be in practice." As Salmon says,[87] "order and quiet are not synonymous, and a monitorial school though perfectly orderly, must have been very noisy in full work. Mr. Baines of Carshalton, speaking in 1878, within the walls of that school in Borough Road which was the direct successor of Lancaster's, said, 'I cannot help comparing the aspect of this room with what it was thirty-seven years ago. Then I was a student here. Round the room were six or seven hundred little boys in drafts, singing l-e-a-p, leap, to jump. The babel was such that I remember on one occasion trying if I should be heard singing "Black Eyed Susan." I sang and no one noticed me. I was Monitor of Order at the Time.' "

Whatever the complete and deserved contempt with which modern educational theory regards the monitorial system, the tremendous part which it played in the development of public in-

---

[84]J. E. G. de Montmorency in his *Progress of Education in England*, London, 1904, says, p. 59, et sq., "The monitorial system was invented by neither Bell nor Lancaster. It was used in France in 1790, by Chevalier Paulet and in England in Elizabethan times it was used commonly." He quotes the "Ludus Litarius" of John Brinsley, published in 1612. A dialogue takes place between two masters of a "poore country schoole,"—"the school should have a master and an usher, supplemented by sub-doctors (pupil teachers) and seniors (monitors)."

[85]See Lancaster's *Improvements*, etc.

[86]*British System of Education*, p. 45, quoted by Salmon, *Joseph Lancaster*, p. 8.

[87]David Salmon, *Life of Joseph Lancaster*, p. 9.

terest in education justifies a brief sketch of its plan.[88] The following points were those which Mr. Lancaster himself believed to be unique and of especial advantage in the system which he had originated:

(a) One master could conduct a school of a thousand pupils.

(b) By printing a spelling book or lesson for reading on one side of a paper in large type and hanging it where all the children could see it, one book served for an entire school.

(c) Slates for writing were used, apparently for the first time.

(d) A special plan was formulated by which any child who could read, could teach Arithmetic.

(e) The system of education was very inexpensive, the cost per annum in a school of 300 children amounting to about 7s. per annum, while the cost per child in larger schools amounted to about 4s.

The Borough Road School was soon known as the Central school, "it includes free schools for boys and girls and the establishment for boarding, clothing and training up young men and women for school masters and mistresses." The very unique feature of the Lancasterian plan, however, was expressed[89] in the following words, "it cannot be reasonably expected that conscientious men should promote a religious opinion contrary to their own; a Presbyterian, Baptist, Quaker, or any other, cannot with sincerity sacrifice his opinions to those of his amiable and Christian brethren of the Establishment. Neither can the last, conscientiously unite entirely in opinion with those of other denominations, but the grand basis of Christianity alone is broad enough for the whole bulk of mankind to stand upon and join hands as the children of one family. Having unity in essentials, let us allow our fellow Christians liberty in what is not essential, and maintain charity in all things: and let us all of whatever sect, unite our humble endeavors to promote the glory of God, and the welfare of our fellow creatures."

---

[88] Joseph Lancaster, *Improvements,* etc. (Abridged edition, 1808, p. 2.)

[89] *Ibid.,* First Edition, 1803, p. 184.

"Everything peculiar to any religious sect or party is studiously excluded and the Bible is the only religious book taught in the school." [90] In June, 1801, a sign was placed over the door of the school in Borough Road: "All who will, may send their children and have them educated freely, and those to whom the above offer may not prove acceptable, may pay for them at a very moderate price."[91]

From the view point of today, it seems astonishing that such a system as the monitorial, could have attracted so great admiration and secured such extensive and wide spread support. Among those who visited Lancaster's school in 1806 were,[92] the Duke and Duchess of Bedford, Lord and Lady Sheffield, very many of the nobility and members of the Royal family. In 1805, the King George Second, sent for Lancaster and subscribed "for a hundred years" 100 pounds annually,[93] for the support of the school.

Andrew Bell[94] was an Anglican clergyman,[95] who, after

---

[90]Joseph Lancaster; *Improvements,* etc. Ed. of 1808, p. 3.

[91]David Salmon,—*Joseph Lancaster,* p. 16.

[92]*Ibid,,* p. 17.

[93]*Ibid.,* 18-19. Mr. Salmon says that the Royal subscription is continued down to the present time, (the British and Foreign School Society).

[94]The longest and most complete biography of Bell is that by Robert Southey, at one time his private secretary. Its three volumes (London, 1844), however and the tediousness of its style, make its reading a veritable task. A later, very brief biography (quite all which the subject justifies) is John Meiklejohn, *An Old Educational Reformer,* Edinburgh, 1888.

[95]Meiklejohn thus summarizes Bell, p. 120, "he was not an interesting man, he was not a great man, he had very little insight into human nature though here and there are to be found glimpses of truth,—he was singularly narrow minded, and he was in several respects, a terrible bore. There is in his own mind hardly a trace of education or the smallest sign of literary culture. He had read Cicero, and Quintilian, Milton and Locke, but he had read them only for the purpose of digging out of them mottoes for the chapters of his work or passages in support of his own conclusions. There is no more trace of literature in all his voluminous writings than there is in the minutes of a corporation or the report of a banking company. He remained to the end of his days of the opinion which he expressed when he was acting as tutor to two American pupils, 'I thought that a good hand writing was better than all the Greek and Latin in the Universe', and even after he was a richly beneficed clergyman, he looked upon Grammar Schools and Universities chiefly as places where people 'contract prejudices.' His whole mind and soul were

going to America to make his fortune, was forced to return to England because of the war of Independence. He brought with him a comfortable nest egg from American tobacco, however, and soon after his return, decided that he would go to India where he seems to have had many and varied interests and activities, combined with a faculty for making money. He succeeded in holding seven chaplaincies and the superintendency of the Madras Military Orphan Asylum at one and the same time[96] and when he returned to England, as he did in 1796, brought with him a fortune of over 26,000 pounds.[97] In 1809, he became[98] master of Sherburn Hospital, a sinecure worth £1200 a year and a residence, and at his death (1832) his fortune amounted to about £150,000.

It was at the Asylum of Madras, that Bell adopted the monitorial system of teaching, but not until his return to England in 1796, did he write a pamphlet[99] on the subject which he published the next year. In 1800, Lancaster came upon this document and in the first edition of his own publication[100] on the same subject,

---

absorbed in the one idea of extending to the whole world the blessings and peculiarities of the Madras system." Of his mental processes, Meiklejohn has the following to say, p. 83, "Dr. Bell was at no time of his life, a clear or methodical writer. He said the same thing,—he had only one or two ideas altogether in his head—over and over again in different ways, in long lumbering sentences and with a ponderosity of manner that repelled and disenchanted."

[96]Robert Southey's *Life of Bell,* ii, p. 19-22.

[97]*Ibid.,* p. 21.

[98]*Ibid.,* p. 262-266.

[99]Andrew Bell, *An Experiment in Education made at the Male (Orphan) Asylum at Madras, suggesting a System by which a School or Family may teach itself, under the Superintendence of the Master or Parent,* London, 1797.

[100]Joseph Lancaster, *Improvements in Education as it Respects the industrious Classes of the Community, containing among other important particulars, a short Account of its present State, Hints towards its Improvement, and a Detail of some practical Experiences conducive to that End,* London, 1803. In the first edition (1803) p. 64, he remarks, "I ought not to close my account without acknowledging the obligations I lie under to Dr. Bell of the Male Asylum of Madras, who so nobly gave up his time and liberal salary that he might perfect that institution which flourished greatly under his fos-

he fully acknowledges that he secured *some* ideas from Bell's description of his plan.

The relations between Bell and Lancaster were most friendly and genial, to all appearances,[101] and the dissension which shortly developed between them and which enlisted nearly all England on one side or the other, seems to have been a clear case of "cherchons la femme."

Mrs. Sarah Trimmer, a friend of Dr. Johnson, and a woman of about sixty years of age at this time, had been for twenty years a promoter of Sunday Schools[102] and a prolific writer of extremely stupid and very moral books, which had great vogue among the pious members of her generation. She also published a periodical (1802-1806) called *The Guardian of Education.* Needless to say, the *Guardian* was strictly in accord with the tenets and sacred offices of the Church of England of which Mrs. Trimmer was a fanatic and bigoted member. She beheld in the growing popularity *and* support of the Lancaster schools, especially in the approval of the King and Royal family, signs of extreme peril to the Establishment. Her first expression of this mediaeval vision was in a letter[103] to Bell,—whom at that time she had not met,—under date of September 24, 1805. "From the time that I read Mr. Joseph Lancaster's *Improvements in Education,* in the first

---

tering care. From this publication (Bell's Experiment) I have adopted several useful *hints* and I beg leave to recommend it to the attentive perusal of friends of education and youth. I much regret that I was unacquainted with the beauty of his system until somewhat far advanced in my plan; if I had known it, it would have saved me much trouble and some retrograde movements. As a confirmation of the goodness of Dr. Bell's plan I have succeeded with one nearly similar in a school attended by 300 children."

[101]Southey's *Life of Bell,* ii, Chap. xx.

[102]It is impossible to touch, in a paper of this length, upon the very important services rendered to the cause of education of the common people in the 19th century, by the Sunday School movement, which was begun in 1780 by Robert Raikes, proprietor of the Gloucester *Journal.* J. F. Bingham, *A Brief History of Sunday Schools,* Buffalo, 1867, J. C. Power, *"The Rise and Progress of Sunday Schools,"* New York, 1863, and J. H. Harris, *Robert Raikes and his Work,* London and New York, 1899, offer the best available accounts of this movement in England.

[103]Southey's *Life of Bell,* ii, p. 131.

edition, I conceived an idea that there was something in his plan inimical to the interests of the Established Church, and when I read your *Experiment in Education* I plainly perceived he had been building on your foundation. You know how the public mind is infatuated with his plausible appearances. Engaged as I have long been, in striving to promote the interests of the Church, by the exertion of my little talents for the instruction of the rising generation, and the prevention of the mischief that is aimed against them in various ways, I cannot see this 'Goliath of Schismatics' bearing down all before him and engrossing the instruction of the common people, without attempting to give him a little check." Again she writes,[104] October 1, 1805, "as for his central school and his organized plans to educate the whole body of the common people *without any regard to the religion of the Nation,* I will certainly do my utmost to check him there, in hopes that others of more ability than myself will be roused." Bell in reply[105] to this letter does not seem over anxious to play David to this "Goliath of Schismatics" and is apparently quite willing to leave the role to Mrs. Trimmer, "I do not mean to enter personally into any polemical discussion or controversial writings in defence of my system, nor even to reclaim my scholastic property and vindicate my literary rights," but he carefully supplies[106] Mrs. Trimmer with all the ammunition which be believes effective, and by the end of November, 1805, she sends him word[107] that she has entirely completed and printed a pamphlet[108] entitled "A Comparative View of the New Plan of Education promulgated by Mr. Joseph Lancaster in his Tracts concerning the Instruction of the Children of the Laboring part of the Community: and of the System of Christian Education founded by our Pious Forefathers for the Initiation of the Young Members of the Established Church in the Principles of the Reformed Religion,"—and the al-

---

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 136.
[105] *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[106] *Ibid.*, p. 142.
[107] *Ibid.*, p. 144.
[108] Mrs. Sarah Trimmer, London, 1805.

tercation began. The solemnity, the fire and the caustic bitterness with which the question of the priority of the invention of this inefficient and unintelligent system was mooted, seems astonishing. It is analogous to that same type of psychology, almost inexplicable when one regards other elements of the British nature, which led Parliament to debate wearyingly and at length for fifty years more or less, on the question whether it was moral and should be made legal, for a man to marry the sister of his dead wife. The fact, however, that such men as Brougham and Sydney Smith with the *Edinburgh* and *Westminster Reviews* on one side,[109] and the clergy, the *Quarterly Review, Blackwood's* and other Tory publications[110] on the other, disputed back and forth, shows plainly that the matter at issue was not who first invented the monitorial system, but what party was to have control of the education of the masses.

Sydney Smith declared in his review[111] of Mrs. Trimmer's publication, that "she began with being cruel and ended by being silly," and closed his remarks with a description of her as "a lady of very respectable opinions and very moderate talents, defending what is right without judgment and believing what is holy without charity."

Few, indeed, were the voices which spoke as did Sir Thomas Bernard.[112] He recognized that the two men had come upon their system independently, weighed the "evidence" and said:[113] "Upon the subject of the comparative merits of Mr. Lancaster and Dr. Bell, a war of words has been waged by their adherents,—like most other wars,—without cause on either side. Some of my

---

[109] *Edinburgh Rev.* ix, Oct. 1806, p. 177,—xi, Oct. 1807 p. 61,—xvii, Nov. 1810, p. 58, xix, Nov. 1811, p. 1. *Quarterly Review*, vi, August, 1811, p. 264, viii, Sept. 1812, p. 1. The *Westminster and Blackwood's* express their views later in the struggle (1830 to 1850).

[110] *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine, Anti-Jacobin Review, British Critic, Morning Post,* etc.

[111] *Edinburgh Review,* 1806.

[112] Sir Thomas Bernard, *The New School,* London, 1810.

[113] *Ibid.,* p. 103.

readers may prefer one and some the other of the two schools. I shall be most happy if half the ignorant poor of this kingdom should have the benefit of one mode of education and the other half of the other mode."

The Royal Lancasterian Institution was founded in 1808. As it was the nucleus of one of the two great voluntary societies which controlled education until 1870, the resolutions of formation are of importance.[114]

"At a meeting held at Mr. William Corston's, No. 30, Ludgate Street. Present,—Messrs. Wm. Corston, Joseph Fox and Joseph Lancaster,—it was unanimously resolved, 'That with a humble reliance upon the blessing of Lord God Almighty and with a single eye to his glory; and with a view to benefit the British Empire; the persons present do constitute themselves a society for the purpose of affording education, procuring employment and as far as possible, to furnish clothing to the children of the poorer subjects of King George III, and also to diffuse the providential discovery of the vaccine inoculation in order that at the same time, they may be instrumental in the hands of Providence to preserve life from loathsome disease; and also, by furnishing objects for the exercise of industry, to render life useful. That in order to prevent any impediment to the prosecution of this grand design, the persons present, do constitute themselves Managers of this Society to plan, prepare and direct all its future operations; and that no business shall be brought before any meeting of subscribers who may probably come forward in aid of this Society but what has been recommended by this committee of managers."

This or some similar check was necessary because of the extreme carelessness of Lancaster in money affairs; he went directly ahead carrying out any plan which he had conceived, without any regard as to possible sources for the money. Naturally his debts became enormous and finally, after being relieved of them many times, irritated at the restrictions demanded by the Trustees of

---

[114]Quoted in David Salmon, *Life of Joseph Lancaster,* p. 38.

the Institution, he began a private enterprise in 1812, and his public work was over.[115]

3. The Beginnings of Parliamentary Agitation and the Creation of the National Society

The opening decade of the nineteenth century brought developments which greatly added to the anxiety of the Anglican supporters.

The Act of 1802,[116] "for the preservation of the health and morals of apprentices" was in reality a compulsory education Act, since in section 6, it declared that apprentices must be instructed for some part of every day for the first four years at least, of their apprenticeship. The law was entirely ineffective[117] however, so nothing had been really gained in the cause of education.

On February 19th, 1807, Samuel Whitbread, a Whig of a Non-Conformist family, introduced[118] (in a complicated "Poor Laws Bill" immediately divided into component parts of which the educational section was known as the "Parochial Schools Bill") a bill for National Education. He believed the time favorable,[119] "because within a few years there has been discovered a plan (the Lancaster) which is now brought to a state of perfection, happily combining rules by which the object of learning must be infallibly attained with expedition and cheapness and holding out the fairest prospect of utility to mankind." The bill provided for the establishment of Lancaster Schools[120] to be supported by parish rates, in parishes where no school for the poorer classes already existed.

The opposition in the Commons was led by Davies Giddy,

---

[115] *Life of Joseph Lancaster*, p. 47.

[116] *42 George III*, c. 73.

[117] See article on "Factory Legislation."

[118] *Hansard*, viii, c. 863.

[119] *Ibid.*, c. 884.

[120] There was no difference in the Lancaster and Bell schools except that in the Lancaster Schools, no religious books other than the Bible were used, while in the Bell (or rather Madras) Schools, the Catechism and Liturgy of the Church of England were taught.

the Anglican son of an Anglican clergyman. "However specious in theory," he says[121] "the project might be of giving education to the laboring classes of the poor, it would in effect be found prejudicial to their morals and happiness,—it would teach them to despise their lot in life, instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank in society destined them. Instead of teaching them subordination, it would render them factious and refractory, as was evident in the manufacturing counties. It would enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity. It would render them insolent to their superiors, and in a few years the result would be that the legislature would find it necessary to direct the strong arm of power towards them and to furnish the executive magistrate with much more vigorous laws than were now in force." In Whitbread's reply[122] he declared that "the question seemed to be whether it was proper that education should be diffused among the lower classes or not," but, despite the opposition, the bill passed[123] the Commons. In the Lords, Lord Stanhope made a vigorous fight in its behalf, but the Archbishop of Canterbury—Sutton—opposed[124] it strenuously,—"the provisions of the bill left little or no control to the minister in his parish. This would go to subvert the first principles of education which had been hitherto, and which he hoped would continue to be, under the control and auspices of the Establishment. Their Lordships would feel how dangerous it was to innovate in such matters. Their Lordships evidently experienced the feeling, for the bill was not returned from the Lords. And as Miss Martineau said,[125] "Did Whitbread take one legislative step in advance, by the enunciation of these truths, he was treated as a benevolent visionary and every particle of his Poor Law reform, and especially his plans for

---

[121] *Hansard,* ix, c. 539 et sq.
[122] *Hansard,* ix, c. 798.
[123] *Journal of the House of Commons,* lxii, p. 824.
[124] *Hansard,* ix, c. 1177.
[125] Harriet Martineau, *Thirty Years Peace,* i, 117.

instruction and the investment of savings (he advocated a public savings bank for the working classes), were sneered away while Ministers and magistrates went on in the usual course of keeping the great body of the people ignorant, dependent, and wretched." No further legislation[126] was attempted for nine years.

In May of 1811 a meeting was held of the Subscribers and Friends of the Royal Lancasterian System of Education, with the Duke of Bedford presiding and the Dukes of Kent and Somerset active in the meeting. Kent announced that the report that the King had withdrawn his support from Lancaster was untrue and urged that the public be appealed to to raise the five thousand pounds of debt on the institution,[127] and this move did not add to the mental peace of Anglican exclusionists.

The following month, June, 1811, occurred an event which brought clearly before the public the question at issue and the fundamental nature of the problem. Herbert Marsh, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, was the preacher at the annual Anniversary service of the Charity Schools which had been established by the S. P. C. K., held in St. Paul's Cathedral.

His sermon was of such great and far-reaching influence in determining the attitude of the Church toward the question of popular education, that it must be analyzed somewhat carefully.

He began with what he deemed the historical aspect of the subject,—"the reformers had laid the foundations for a system of religious education by the exhortations to god-fathers and god-mothers requiring that the child be instructed as soon as he could learn, in the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, Creed, and Catechism; and to make certain that this religious education was conducted in accordance with the doctrines of the

---

[126]In his *Diary*, vol. ii, p. 60, Romilly remarks, "Many persons think that the subject requires further consideration and a more matured plan—but I am afraid a much greater portion of the House think it expedient that the people should be kept in a state of ignorance."

[127]Account of this meeting is to be found in the *Edinburgh Review*, November, 1811, vol. 19, and in Salmon's *Joseph Lancaster*, pp. 42-43. For further information on the Lancasterian Society, see the *Philanthropist*, edited by Wm. Allen, the Quaker, 1812.

Church of England, it was enacted by the 77th canon, that every schoolmaster should not only be licensed by the Bishop of the diocese but should previously subscribe to the Liturgy and Articles, and this was confirmed by the 79th canon which bade schoolmasters not only to use the Catechism but to bring their pupils to Church." [128]

"The Liturgy is confirmed by the law of the land, and in every country national education must be conducted on the principle of national religion,—in this country no system can be entitled to the appellation of 'national,' where the Liturgy is discarded or where the children do not attend the Established Church. Indeed the parochial (the charity) schools were invariably conducted in such a way as to educate the children for the National religion. They were members of the Church, revered the rites and ordinances, attended the parish church and the parish school.[129] Had this system of parochial education been carried to a greater extent or had it been retained, the defection from the Established Church would never have reached its present heights."

He assures[130] the audience that these laws are not restrictive on the worship or education of Dissenters, but are merely security for the Church of England. "And," he adds, "the Dissenters show more wisdom than the Establishment in promoting the education best adapted to their own purpose. The Establishment makes no provision for a national education; can the Clergy conscientiously support any other than a Church of England education?"

Dr. Marsh expresses the keenest alarm over the extensive patronage and growth of the Lancaster school system and taking up Lancaster's pamphlet, *Improvements,* etc., which he proves[131] to his own satisfaction to have been stolen from Bell, he inter-

---

[128] *Anniversary Sermon of the Charity Schools for 1811*, p. 3, et sq.

[129] He is evidently referring to the schools established just after the Reformation.

[130] *Anniversary Sermon,* 1811, p. 20.

[131] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

prets some of its passages as distinctly hostile to the Church of England. "Mr. Lancaster says, 'I long to see men who profess Christianity contend not for Creeds of faith, words and names, but in the practice of every heavenly virtue'." "Evidently," says Dr. Marsh, "Mr. Lancaster must long to see the Church of England abandon her Creed and her name." [132]

"The educator in question has formally declared that he objects to Creeds in general, and he has declared it in the work which is intended to describe his plan of education. His scholars therefore who necessarily imbibe the sentiments of their master, will soon acquire a contempt for the National Creed. Can the result of such an education be doubtful? Will the children thus educated have to choose when they come to years of discretion whether they shall be Churchmen or not? No! They will long before have decided against the Church." [133] Again, "we must clearly perceive that if the system is accompanied with such religious instruction as is calculated to create indifference and even dislike for the Established Church, the most powerful engine that was ever devised against it, is now at work for its destruction." [134]

"Suppose that Mr. Lancaster obtains the principal care in a National system of education, what is to become of the religion now already established? If already its doctrines are called bigotry and its constitution intolerance, what must be its fate if the power and influence arising from education should be wholly withdrawn from it." [135]

"Our parochial and charity schools have hitherto been Church of England schools. Why not by the extensive application of this new system under our own director expand the benefits of these very schools and thus embrace within its pale, all indigent children?" [136]

---

[132] *Anniversary Sermon*, 1811, p. 17.
[133] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[134] *Anniversary Sermon, 1811*, p. 18.
[135] *Ibid.*, Note, p. 19.
[136] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

The sermon aroused support and opposition. The *Edinburgh Review* remarks,[137] "Let Dr. Marsh be informed once for all that there is in this country no national education,—that the law of the land is utterly indifferent to the subject—that every man (whether happily or not, we are not prepared to say) is left to educate his children as he pleases, and that the public funds afford as little assistance to the poor in attaining this object, as the laws impose restrictions upon the mode of pursuing it." "For the Church as established in this country, we cherish the utmost respect. We not only grudge her none of those rights wherewithal she is plentifully endowed—but would have her dignities and her honor secured. Hence it is that we view with more than common indignation the men whom we have now been occupied in exposing to the public; because in them we see the enemies of the poor and of the Church—of Education and of Religion,—men who would bring ruin upon the Establishment by opposing the most enlightened and disinterested attempt that ever yet was made, in any country, for scattering the blessings of knowledge and moral improvement among the more helpless classes of our species," [138]—(it must be remembered that Brougham was one of the earliest members of the Lancasterian Society).

The Church rallied promptly; by October, 1811, plans were on foot and on the sixteenth of that month, with the Archbishop of Canterbury presiding, the S. P. C. K. and its "friends" resolved to found a new society for religious education to be known as "The National Society for the Education of the Poor, in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales," and at its foundation twenty thousand pounds were secured in contributions, with annual subscriptions amounting to fifteen hundred pounds.[139] The society was incorporated in 1817 "as a perpetual Society and Community."

---

[137] *Edinburgh Review,* xix, 1811, p. 29.

[138] *Ibid.,* p. 41.

[139] Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the S. P. C. K.,* p. 153.

The active educational efforts of the S. P. C. K. now fell to the National Society, which it supplied with books at nominal rates. By a plan of union with the National Society, no books were to be allowed in the National Schools other than those which appeared in the catalogue of the S. P. C. K.[140] By 1815 the National Society reported[141] 122 schools erected, 336 masters, and 86 mistresses trained (in the Madras system) at the central school, later in Baldwin's gardens, and already at work,—and 100,000 children then being educated in the 570 schools formally united to the National Society. By 1816[142] there were 1,009 schools united to the Society, containing 155,000 children. (There is great reason to believe that most reports of this nature at this period were, in all activities, subject to grave doubts of accuracy. Any society, even to-day, dependent upon public bounty for support, puts forth reports which close investigation seldom completely justifies. It is one of the worst features in the eternal struggle to raise adequate support for necessary work.)

In 1814 the Lancasterian Institution was incorporated as the "British and Foreign School Society" and these two voluntary bodies dominated the educational field until 1870.

4. The Revival of Parliamentarian Agitation and the First Step in Government Interference in Popular Education

In May, 1816, Lord Brougham moved[143] for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the state of education of the lower orders in London, Westminster, and Southwark, basing his request on the findings of several individuals, who for their own purposes had made a house to house canvass of certain districts and were appalled at the disclosures. In Shadwell, there were 14,000 Irish Catholics of whom 89 could read and for whose 4,000 children no provision whatsoever for school-

[140] *Account of the Charity Schools*, 1812, p. 169.
[141] *Account of 1815*, p. 36.
[142] *Account of 1816*, p. 55.
[143] *Hansard* xxxiv, c. 633.

ing was made. "Combining his statistics, he believed that out of 1,050,000 of the last census, 90,000 to 100,000 children (probably nearer 200,000) had no provision for education." The motion was agreed[144] to, the committee appointed, and the next month he presented[145] an abridged report in the Commons. It had been enquiring into charity and parochial schools, subscription and Sunday Schools and had investigated Charter House, Christ's Hospital and Westminster which, "founded for the poor, were chiefly occupied by sons of gentlemen possessed of slender incomes." An estimate of the number of children without any educational resources was reckoned as about 120,000.

The investigation seemed to show[146] that the funds of the charity and parish schools were very large but were not always administered "so purely or so wisely" as could be desired. From circulars of the schools, it seemed apparent that eighteen thousand pounds was educating three thousand children. He believed that Parliament should aid in erecting schools in the city of London, but that the funds available for their support would be sufficient if carefully managed.

Lord Brougham had aroused some little feeling over his questions concerning the use of funds, but as yet the large vested interests had not taken alarm. The next year he sought[147] the revival of the Committee for investigation into the education of the lower orders, and he reports[148] to the Commons the abuses which the Committee discovered.

The third report of that Committee declared[149] "there is the most unquestionable evidence that the anxiety of the poor for education continues not only unabated but daily increasing; that it extends to every part of the country, and is to be found equally prevalent in those smaller towns and country districts

[144] *Ibid.*, 636.

[145] *Ibid.*, c. 1230.

[146] *Ibid.*, c. 1232.

[147] *Hansard* xxxvi, c. 822.

[148] *Ibid.*, c. 1303.

[149] *Third Report of the Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders*, 1818, vol. iv, Intro., p. 4.

where no means of gratifying it are provided by the charitable efforts of the richer classes. Wherever the efforts of individuals can support the requisite number of schools, it would be unnecessary and injurious to interpose any Parliamentary assistance. But in many places private subscriptions could be raised to meet the yearly expenses of a school while the original cost of the undertaking occasioned chiefly by the erection and purchase of the schoolhouse, prevents it from being attempted." This is the foreshadowing of the first type of government assistance that was ever given.

The same year, Mr. Brougham secured,[150] despite bitter opposition in the Lords,[151] a Royal Commission to enquire into the appropriation of charity funds. His bill was not allowed to go through without much mangling, of which he complained strenuously in a published letter to Sir Samuel Romilly. The matter was canvassed vigorously, the amount of invective heaped upon Brougham offering prompt cause for suspicion. The *Quarterly Review*[152] was particularly acrimonious and it was very evident that there was no willingness on the part of the close, powerful, and exclusive corporations to undergo an examination. There were four Commissions in existence during twenty-one years and in that time, from 1819 to 1840, the reports filled thirty-eight folios. The annual income of the charities investigated amounted to about 1,209,395 pounds,[153] while the total wealth was about 75,000,000 pounds, and there were 11,000 parishes in England and Wales with between forty thousand and fifty thousand charitable institutions.[154]

On June 28, 1820, Brougham brought[155] in the first bill dealing exclusively with National Education. It was certain of defeat from its initial arrangements,—it provided (1) that

---

[150] *58 George III*, c. 91, *Hansard* xxxviii, c. 835.
[151] Lord Eldon led the opposition. *Hansard* xxxviii, c. 1212 to 1249.
[152] *Quarterly Review*, xix, p. 502.
[153] J. P. Kay Shuttleworth, *Public Education*, London, 1853, p. 161.
[154] *Hansard* xxxviii, c. 1229.
[155] *Hansard* New Series, 2, c. 67.

schools might be formed by the Quarter Sessions on its own initiative, on the representation of two justices of the peace, the clergyman of the parish or five householders; the cost of the building was to be provided by the treasurer of the county rates, ultimately by the receiver general of the land tax and all other expenses were to be levied half yearly by the parish officers. (2) The vestry was to appoint the schoolmaster, a communicant member of the Church of England certified as to character by the clergyman of the parish, and subject to rejection or removal at any time by the clergyman. (Needless to say, the Dissenters could not agree to any such proposition.) (3) Children were to be compelled to attend the Church or Chapel of their faith upon Sundays and a school meeting was to be held on Sunday evenings to teach the Liturgy and Catechism, the Bible alone, however, to be taught in the day schools. (4) The old education endowments were to be administered on a reform plan.

A storm of opposition was raised among Dissenters and Catholics and Brougham made no further effort to promote that bill. It must not be supposed that he believed in the justice of Church control, but standing as he was, almost alone in Parliament, and determined to start some move toward popular education for which he never ceased to struggle, he evidently felt that all effort would be useless without large concessions to the clergy. Of this attempt, Miss Martineau writes,[156] "No scheme of popular education can ever become national in this country which gives the management of schools and appointment of masters to the Church while Dissenters constitute a large proportion of the inhabitants in almost every district, especially the most populous; when the Dissenters bear their full share in the education which already exists. Whenever all parties shall consent (how little she understood the Church) to establish a system of secular education providing for religious training to be carried on in perfect freedom by the clergy and ministers of the respective denominations, the nation may enjoy a system of general education, but not until then."

[156]Harriet Martineau, *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, i, p. 351.

There was no attempt at legislative interference between the years 1820 and 1830, but the subject was of steadily growing interest in the minds of the people. In 1825, when Brougham published his *Observations on the Education*[157] *of the People,*[158] the pamphlet ran through twenty editions in less than a year. This period, 1820-1835, was one of many lines of development toward popular educational activities. In 1827, Brougham and others founded the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge" and set up Mechanics' Institutes in many localities. Reading Rooms were opened and many cheap periodicals (the Penny Magazine), cyclopedias, etc., were published. Educational societies of all types appear.

By 1833 petitions came[159] into the Commons from many sources (chiefly the manufacturing districts, however) begging for the promotion of a National system of education. The passage of the Reform Bill with its increased franchise, had suggested the danger (even to those usually opposed to popular education) of the dense ignorance of the people, and opposition to popular education was dwindling.

In July, 1833, J. H. Roebuck introduced[160] a measure to be followed by a bill the next session, for a compulsory education law and a National school system, but at a hint from Althorp that the Government was maturing plans, he withdrew the motion. Most unfortunately, Brougham had accepted the Lord High Chancellorship, and for four years was in a position where he could no longer serve as the voice of the people. He lost, for some time, the confidence which had made the common people look to him as the champion of their needs and rights. By this year the British and Foreign School Society had 90 schools in

---

[157] *Blackwoods*, May, 1825, p. 534. "It would be extremely impolitic to give this pamphlet its true name—'a plan for forming the laboring orders into a disaffected and ungovernable faction.'"

[158] J. E. G. de Montmorency, *State Intervention in English Education*, Cambridge, 1902, p. 233.

[159] *Hansard* 3rd S. 15, c. 760. *Journal of the House*, 88, pp. 57 and 269.

[160] *Hansard* 3rd S. xx. c. 139.

London with 15,000 pupils[161] and 400 schools in the country, while the National Society had about 12,000 schools in union with it.[162]

The quality of the education in these schools was most inferior. Sara Coleridge, whose husband and brother were both promoters of National Normal schools, writes[163] (1834) "I am sorry to say that nothing or next to nothing is learned and the parents merely pay for having their children kept out of harm's way. Till some better system is adopted than at present generally prevails, and the art of teaching is regularly taught, I fear the National Schools[164] will remain very inefficient."

A few years later, seven years beyond the time which this paper is intended to cover, the famous Walter Farquhar Hook, Vicar of Leeds, wrote to the Bishop of St. David's, saying,[165] "The National schools in the rich districts are excellent, in the other districts—very bad. There are many, where one young man is apt to have one hundred or one hundred and fifty dirty, ragged little urchins assembled in a miserable building now dignified by the name of a National School room, and is expected to convert them in as short a time as possible into well bred, intelligent children.—I have known instances where children who have been two years at a National School have left it, unable to read.—Is it not a mere mockery to say that there is religious instruction in our National schools merely because the

[161] Holman, *English National Education,* London, 1898, p. 44.

[162] J. E. G. de Montmorency, *State Intervention,* etc., pp. 206-7.

[163] *Memoirs of Sara Coleridge,* London, 1873, i, p. 193.

[164] Some amusing school books were produced in the determined effort to bind religious and secular education. An Arithmetic was written for use in the National Schools, by J. C. Wigrain, Secretary of the Society, of which the following are specimen problems, (1) "The children of Israel were sadly given to idolatry, notwithstanding all they knew of God. Moses was compelled to have three thousand men put to death for this grievous sin. What digits would you use to express that number?" (2) "Of Jacob's four wives, Leah had six sons, Rachel had two, Hillah had two, and Zillah had two. How many sons had Jacob?" (Quoted in Francis Adams, *Elementary School Contest in England,* London, 1882, p. 102.)

[165] W. F. Hook, *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's,* London, 1846, pp. 11-13.

children are allowed to dog's ear a Bible?[166]—Those who know the bitterness of local politics (I intend not to blame one party more than the other) will feel the importance of the suggestion I am making of placing the supervision of the schools in the hands of persons interested in the general welfare of a country and cognizant of the wants and of its peculiarities and yet removed from parochial or corporation cabals." [167]

"The sole object of the National Society is to manufacture members of the Church, not to impart information which would be useful in the pursuits of life." [168] Not even government reports were always trustworthy, and were open to suspicion of padding.

"The bulk of children included in these imposing government reports were taught in private adventure schools kept by dames and others. They were hived in dirty unwholesome rooms, used for sleeping or working in, garrets and often in cellars. The qualifications of their teachers were that they were unfit for anything else, though they generally united education with some other employment, such as keeping of small shops, taking in washing or sewing."[169] As late as 1840, this report comes from the Committee of the Council (p. 178), "In the mining districts most of those who went to school at all were taught by miners or laborers who had lost health or met with accidents in the works." [170]

Dr. Hook had very interesting and very influential comments to make upon the Establishment itself, as well as upon the character of the National Schools. "It is prime fiction to assert that the state by Act of Parliament has established the Church of England, or any other form of Christianity to which it is bound to render pecuniary support or to afford any other

[166] W. F. Hook, *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's,* London, 1846, p. 46.

[167] *Ibid.,* p. 70.

[168] *Quarterly Journal of Education,* 1834, p. 253, Quoted by Adams, "Elementary School Contest," p. 95.

[169] *British and Foreign Review,* 1836, p. 589, quoted by Adams, p. 96.

[170] *Report of Committee of Council,* 1839-1840, p. 178.

support than such as every class of her Majesty's subjects has a right to demand. The Church has inherited property, together with certain rights and it has a claim upon protection similar to that of any other corporation. The Church has no more claim for exclusive pecuniary aid at all, than is possessed by any other of those many corporations with which our country abounds." [171] "If the Church of England claims a right to the exclusive education of the people it becomes her duty to supply the deficiency in funds required, by appropriating her property to the purpose." [172] "The state should endow schools in which purely literary or secular instruction is imparted with due care to impress the children that this instruction is not enough, but that religious instruction is compulsory in the Chapel or Church of their parents.[173]

On August 17, 1833, on the proposal of Lord Althorp, the motion was made[174] and passed[175] that Parliament should grant twenty thousand pounds for the erection of school houses, the money to be expended through the National and British and Foreign Societies, with the condition that grants from this fund would be made only when the district desiring a schoolhouse, raised half the needed amount. On the face of it this was a serious blunder, for the districts which needed schools most, could not afford any money whatsoever towards the erection of the building.

Cobbett's attitude[176] is somewhat surprising, "Education is not improving the condition of the country. It has been more and more spread, but to what does it all tend? To nothing but to increase the number of schoolmasters and mistresses, that new race of idlers. Crime, too, goes on increasing. If so, what reason is there to tax the people for the increase of education?

---

[171] W. F. Hook, *Letter to the Bishop of St. David's* (1846), p. 38.
[172] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[173] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[174] *Hansard* 3rd S. 20, c. 730.
[175] *Journal of the Commons*, 88, pp. 692-693.
[176] *Hansard* 3rd S. xx, c. 719.

It is nothing but an attempt to force education. It is a French—a doctrinnaire—plan, and I shall always be opposed to it."

A digest of educational conditions, supplied by the Manchester Statistical Society, shows[177] that at this time (1833),—

In all towns, of those of school age, about one in twelve was having some daily teaching.

In all towns, of those of school age, about one in twenty-four was having education of any value.

In Leeds, of those of school age, about one in forty-one was having education of any value.

In Birmingham, of those of school age, about one in thirty-eight was having education of any value.

In Manchester, of those of school age, about one in thirty-five was having education of any value.

A digest prepared a little later shows[178] the following conditions,—

	1836	1837	1838
Wholly uninstructed or having received only first rudiments of learning	85.85%	87.93%	87.81%
Able to read and write well	10.56%	9.46%	8.71%
Instructed beyond reading and writing	.91%	.43%	.34%
Intellectual condition not known	2.68%	2.18%	2.08%

In April, 1834, Brougham addressed[179] the Commons at length, emphasizing (1) the inefficiency of the means for National education, (2) the necessity of supplementing them, (3) the need of training schools for teachers, and (4) the wisdom of the appointment of a permanent Board of Commissioners, but conditions remained unchanged. Between 1833 and 1839, Parliament passed an annual grant of twenty thousand pounds to be administered by the two voluntary societies, but under the proviso that the district applying for assistance in erecting a school must supply half the funds itself, the National Society secured four fifths of the grants after the first year, for the British and Foreign Society had no wealth back of it comparable to that of the Church, and consequently exhausted its funds the first year.[180]

[177] Quoted in J. P. Kay Shuttleworth, *Four Periods of Education*, p. 192.
[178] *Ibid.*, p. 195.
[179] *Hansard* 3rd S. xxii, c. 843-852, 854-859.
[180] *Hansard* 3rd S. xxxix, c. 448.

A Parliamentary Paper[181] of 1837-1838 shows that between 1833 and March, 1838, 714 National Schools with 140,591 pupils had received aid to the amount of 69,710 pounds, while 187 British and Foreign Schools had received assistance.

In 1837 the subject was broached[182] again by Mr. Slaney in the Commons, and Lord Brougham in the Lords,[183] citing objections to the methods of dividing Parliamentary grants on the existing basis, and advocating a Board or Minister of Education, with a standing committee.

Nothing was done however, and in 1838, Mr. Wyse moved[184] an address to the Queen, asking her to appoint a Board of Commissioners of Education in England to provide for the "wise, equitable and efficient distribution of Parliamentary grants and for the establishment of Normal schools for the training of teachers." The fact that the motion was lost by only four votes shows clearly how much public sentiment was growing in favor of State authority in popular education. It seems reasonable to believe that, as the *Westminster Review* said,[185] Wyse had forced the hand of the government. In any case the government took the initiative, and in February, 1839, Lord John Russell announced[186] that, on the advice of the Queen, he would appoint a board from the privy council, this board to be responsible to Parliament and to have under its authority the selection and establishment of necessary means to form a normal school for the training of teachers, and also that this board should have control of the making of grants from Parliamentary funds, which up to this time had been controlled by the two voluntary societies. In the report[187] of this Committee in Council, which Lansdowne drew up, the arrangement for a Normal school pro-

[181] *Accounts and Papers,* 1837-1838, xxxviii, 325, 365.

[182] *Hansard* 3rd S. xxxix, c. 381.

[183] *Ibid.,* c. 425.

[184] Wyse had been extremely active and able in the establishment of educational plans in Ireland. *Hansard* 3rd S. xliii, c. 710.

[185] *Westminster Review,* 51, p. 182.

[186] *Hansard* 3rd S. xlv, c. 280.

[187] *Report of Committee in Council,* 1839, xli, 263.

vided for "general religious instruction" with "specific instruction" from a Chaplain or Ministers of the different denomination.

The storm roused was tremendous. Sir Robert Peel immediately opposed[188] the Committee and its plans, on the ground that the Church was absolutely awake to the necessity of her assumption of the position she ought to assume, in taking charge of the education of the people,—to which Lord Russell replied[189] that while he saw, with pleasure, the exertion the Church was making after her very long slumber, "still I do entertain some apprehensions in regard to the manner in which this newly awakened zeal would be exercised,—if there were no suspicions timely aroused, as to the possibility of its being abused and perverted to ends very mischievous, because I, in common with others, have seen theories propounded and doctrines advanced in respect to the state of the Church, which I certainly think if pushed out to their full consequences, would establish a system by which the whole education of the people should be placed in the hands of the Church and by which none but members of the Church would have the right of partaking of that education."

The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge protested against the possibility of invasion of the sacred "rights" of the Church, in the following resolutions,[190]—"That the S. P. C. K. was the first society in the kingdom to support the general education of the people; and that from its first establishment in the year 1698, it has endeavored by all the means in its power to promote religious instruction upon principles of the Church of England. That while your Petitioners disclaim all interference with the education of those who differ from them in their religious principles, they are of the opinion that the authority of the State ought not to be given to any scheme of education which involves principles contrary to the Church as established by the law of the land. That your Petitioners strongly object to any plan of National instruction which may remove

[188] *Hansard* 3rd S. xlv, c. 309.
[189] *Ibid.*, c. 311.
[190] Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of S. P. C. K.*, p. 157.

the education of the people from the pastoral care and guidance of the clergy.

"But your Petitioners have heard with extreme regret that a scheme of education has been laid before Parliament under the sanction of a Committee of Her Majesty's privy council by which teachers of any sect or religion, however 'erroneous' or hostile to the Church, may be admitted to give instruction in the school or schools and that into such school or schools erroneous versions of the Holy Scriptures may also be introduced, under the same authority. That such scheme appears to your Petitioners to be calculated to throw discredit upon the authorized version of the Bible, to encourage indifference and error, and to be injurious to the interests both of the Established Church and of Christianity itself. Your Petitioners, therefore, most humbly pray that your Honorable House will refuse to support and sanction the said scheme or to grant any money for these or any such purposes."

The members of the National Society passed[191] like resolutions and the S. P. C. K. granted them five thousand pounds "to further their objects."

In the Lords, the opposition was even more bitter, the Bishop of London declaring[192] that "if a system of National religious education were to be based on the principle of giving to members of every different sect, the same advantages enjoyed by the Established Church, the Establishment might just as well, so far as her connection with the State and the use and object of that connection was concerned, abdicate its functions." It is the duty[193] of the clergy and particularly of the Bishops, as the *rulers* of the Church of England, to protest against all attempts to force upon the people of this country as 'national,' any system which is not connected with the Established Church and which by implication, though he hoped not by intention, was calculated

---

[191] Allen and McClure, *Two Hundred Years of the History of the S. P. C. K.*, p. 158.

[192] *Hansard* 3rd S. xlvii, c. 757.

[193] *Ibid.*, c. 759.

to throw discredit upon that Church, or at least *to raise all Dissenting sects to a level with it in the estimation of the people.*"

The alarm of the Church was due, not so much to the fact of the recognized civil equality, but because it was impossible to say just where that civil power would end. As Kay Shuttleworth said,[194] "The Church firmly refused to relinquish her supremacy in matters of religion, the Dissenters sternly rejected her ascendancy, and the people remained with feeble and inefficient means of instruction or were abandoned to absolute ignorance and neglect."

Lord Brougham replied[195] sharply and pertinently to the Bishop of Lincoln, but so great, however, was the bitterness of feeling that the Government abandoned its attempt to establish a Normal School, but stood fast in regard to the Committee of Council.[196]

All were eager to see what would be the action of the Commons when Lord Russell asked[197] for a grant of thirty thousand pounds to be expended through the Committee instead of through the voluntary societies. The grant was made. "In the same year," sneered Brougham, "in which thirty thousand pounds was granted for the education of the people, seventy thousand pounds was granted for building the royal stables." [198] And Carlyle remarked[199] that the grant was a small fraction of the revenue for one day.

The Church made one last attempt to prevent the change in

[194] J. P. Kay Shuttleworth, *Public Education*, p. 5.

[195] *Hansard* 3rd S. xlvii, 763-764.

[196] *Order in Council Creating the Committee of the Privy Council of Education*, 1839, vol. xli (287), 265. At the Court of Buckingham Palace, the 10th of April, 1839, "It is this day ordered by Her Majesty in Council, that the Most Honorable Henry, Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord President of the Council; the Right Honorable John William, Viscount Duncannon, Lord Privy Seal; the Right Honorable Lord John Russell, one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State; the Right Honorable Thomas Spring-Rice, Chancellor of Her Majesty's Exchequer, be and they are hereby appointed a Committee to Superintend the Application of any Sums voted by Parliament for the Purpose of Promoting Public Education." (Signed) C. C. Greville.

[197] *Hansard* 3rd S. xlviii, c. 731.

[198] Quoted by Spencer Walpole in *History of England*, iii, p. 487.

[199] *Ibid.*

the authority over the funds of Parliamentary grants. On motion[200] of the Archbishop of Canterbury the Lords voted (229 vs. 111) an address to the Queen urging her to permit no steps to be taken until the Lords could go into the question more deeply. Her reply[201] was a dignified rebuke—she appreciated the zeal of the Lords, she was always ready to receive their advice, but much regretted that they had offered it at this time. "It is with a deep sense of duty, that I have thought it right to appoint a committee of my Privy Council to superintend the distribution of the grants voted by the House of Commons for Public Education. Of the proceedings of this Committee, annual reports will be laid before Parliament so that the House of Lords will be able to exercise its judgment upon them and I trust that the funds placed at my disposal will be found to have been distinctly applied to the objects for which they were granted and with a faithful attention to the security of the Established Church."

"Thus," [202] says one of the members of one of the first committees, "the Church in defense of her traditional privileges assumed the responsibility of resisting by the utmost exercise of her authority and influence in the country, in both Houses of Parliament and at the foot of the Throne, the first great plan ever proposed by the Government for the education of the humblest classes in Great Britain."

It must not be imagined that any great advance was attained through this Board of 1839. The Church refused to accept any grants for some time, but after the Concordat of 1839-1840 by which the inspectors chosen by the Committee had to be confirmed by the Bishop, she willingly enough took all she could secure and the census of 1851, (xvii) shows[203] that of the 500,000 pounds voted by Parliament for education between the years 1839 and 1850, 405,000 pounds went to those Church schools where all were excluded who would not be taught the Catechism and Liturgy.

[200] *Hansard,* 3rd. S. xlviii, c. 1234.
[201] *Hansard,* 3rd. S. xlix, c. 128 (July 11, 1839).
[202] Kay Shuttleworth, *Public Education,* pp. 3-4.
[203] Quoted by Adams, *Elementary School Contest,* p. 114.

The measure of 1839 was of small import financially, but it involved a vital principle. A civil as opposed to an ecclesiastic education is asserted in the creation of a state department,—the fact that the Church accepted funds from that department later, implies her recognition of the principle involved. It was not, however, until 1870 under the direction of the Quaker, Wm. Forster, that any real advance was made in the cause of secular, efficient, popular education. Nevertheless, the creation of the Committee of Council of 1839, was the opening wedge of government authority,—was the lopping off of the first tentacle of the octopus grip which had long strangled all hope of general intellectual development.

When one scans the roll of those who opposed protective legislation for children, when he considers those who have opposed every forward step calculated to add to the betterment of the conditions of the laboring classes, he is tempted to say[204] with John Morley,—"Dissent, it is true, offers little that touches the fastidious and sentimental love, which is so much in fashion in our times, for the picturesque, the gorgeous, the romantic, the sweetly reasonable. Its creeds are said to be narrow, its spirit contentious, its discipline unscriptural, its ritual bleak, its votaries plebeian. As politicians we need not greatly exercise ourselves in these high matters. The Dissenters have not been favorably placed for the acquisition of the more delicate graces. To stand in the pillory, to have your ears slit, to lie in Bishops' prisons, to be driven forth by the hundred from home and sustenance, to be hunted with Five Mile Acts, Conventicle Acts, Test Acts, Schism Acts,—the memory of these things may well leave a tincture of sourness in the descendants of those who suffered them, and a tincture of impatience with the bland teachers who invite them to contrast their pinched theology and sullen liturgy with the modest splendor, the unassuming state, the mild Majesty of the Church that afflicted and persecuted them. Dissent is not picturesque but it possesses a heroic political record. It has little in the way of splendor and state but it has a consistent legend of civil enlightenment."

[204] John Morley, *The Struggle for National Education*, London, 1873, p. 7.

"There is not a single crisis in the growth of English liberties in which the State Church has not been the champion of retrogression and obstruction. In nearly every crisis she has made herself the ally of tyranny, the organ of social oppression, the champion of intellectual bondage." [205]

"The political history of our Episcopal Establishment in England, in Scotland and in Ireland, has been one long and unvarying course of enmity to justice, to enlightenment and to freedom.[206]

5. Promoters of Popular Education

It is perhaps needless to say anything more on the subject of the promoters of secular popular education. The entire text of the preceding chapter has been dealing with that theme. But there are one or two points to which reference may not be out of place.

(a) Samuel Whitbread, who first brought the matter of secular popular education before Parliament, was of a Nonconformist family, and (b) Joseph Lancaster, who first enunciated the belief that schools should include all of every denomination and teach only the common principles of Christianity and who carried out that belief in his own schools, was a Quaker. (c) Lord Brougham, who did more than any one individual of his day, for the cause of popular education, was a member of the Lancastrian society. (d) Wyse, who spoke frequently in Parliament upon the subject and who was believed to have forced the government to take action, by his steadfast efforts, was a Roman Catholic. (e) Lord John Russell, who first broke through the iron bars of Anglican imprisonment of popular education, was himself an Anglican, but with a firm Whig belief in civil and religious liberty. (f) To the Dissenters of course, may be attributed every step of advance that was made toward the establishment of national, secular education, free from religious creed or doctrine.

---

[205] John Morley, *The Struggle for National Education,* London, 1873, p. 3.
[206] *Ibid.,* p. 7.

VIII

CONCLUSION

No individual, no political movement, no social activity, no religion, expresses the full measure of its spirit in the history of its own life. The threads of contrasting and contradictory motive are interwoven, modifications are forced by the complexities presented in life itself, courses are swerved and influenced by the strength of human relationships. No individual nor movement can proceed unhampered and undiverted, directly to its goal.

The twentieth century has seen the birth of a new idea in philanthropy, has recognized a new motive dominant in humanitarianism, and has decreed that justice with all its implications, as well as compassion, shall be the basic ideal of every effort to create a happier, more wholesome world. With this new emphasis, there is, perhaps, a tendency to minimize the efforts made and the results achieved by those whose labors expressed a simpler, more elemental emotion; one is perhaps, prone to interrogate unsympathetically the sources which inspired the activities of the past.

The great religious revival of the eighteenth century has been accused of inspiring men to focus their spiritual vision too exclusively upon the promise of a world to come, of leading them to shirk their social human responsibilities that they might secure the safety of their own souls.

This hypothesis deserves most careful investigation. The sources of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have barely been tapped; some of the fields have not even been opened, and until all the evidence is uncovered, until the entire story has been told, History may not present herself as religious enthusiast or unsympathetic skeptic.

Nevertheless, from the evidences submitted in this brief

paper, a tentative conclusion suggests itself, that Evangelicalism (in which for this present purpose is included all Dissent) did not confine its spiritual manifestations to the process of soul-saving, did not ignore its worldly responsibilities in the effort to secure personal and eternal happiness. Of those who promoted the reforms treated in this paper, the number showing Evangelical antecedents is in an overwhelming majority, and early nineteenth century action was much more largely dominated by religious conviction and philosophic bias, than the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have been. But those who sought reform in this early nineteenth century, neither understood nor had available the weapons of diffused wealth, of popular education and of popular political power, which enable humanitarianism of today to demand and to employ justice, as well as compassion, in the foundations of the social structures which it seeks to rear.

For the crystallizing of this conception, for the forging of the instruments by which it may be translated into fact, the world is greatly in the debt of spiritual reactions from the material conditions developed through the industrial revolution, that revolution whose share in the spiritual development of mankind is rarely recognized.

We, of the twentieth century, can not but feel that the message of this new humanitarianism is true, that its theory is sound and that its broad inclusiveness and strong foundation of justice, hold the first great promise for universal and integrated progress. Only misunderstanding and entire misconception of both evolution and perspective however, can fail to see that the view point of today has sources in other eras, that it has developed from a humanitarism as sincere as our own, and, like our own, evoked from the social, political and economic conditions of its day.

IX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Libraries

Columbia University Library, New York City.
Library of Union Theological Seminary.
The New York Public Library.
The Library of Teachers College.
The private pamphlet library of Professor E. R. A. Seligman.

II. General Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Annual Register.
Dictionary of National Biography.
Journal of the House of Commons.
Journal of the House of Lords.
Parliamentary Debates, (Hansard).
Reports of Committees.—(The reports of the committees investigating the different fields are to be found listed in the special bibliographies.)
Statutes at Large.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Cambridge Modern History. New York, 1909.
Cunningham, William.—Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times. Cambridge, 1912.
Cooke-Taylor, William.—Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire, 1842.
Defoe, Daniel.—Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain. London, 1724.
Dunlop, O. J., and Denman, R.—English Apprenticeship and Child Labor. New York, 1912.
Espinasse, Francis.—Lancashire Worthies. London, 1877.
de Gibbins, H.—Industry in England. New York, 1910.
de Gibbins, H.—English Social Reformers. London, 1902.

Gray, Kirkman B.—A History of English Philanthropy from the Dissolution of the Monasteries until the taking of the First Census. London, 1905.

Hobson, J. A.—The Industrial System. London, 1909.

Hodder, Edwin.—The Life and Work of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. London, 1888.

Holyoake, George J.—Sixty Years in an Agitator's Life. London, 1900.

Hutchins, B. L., and Harrison, A.—The History of Factory Legislation. London, 1911.

Keeling, Frederic.—Child Labor in the United Kingdom. London, 1914.

Kydd, Samuel, "Alfred."—The History of the Factory Movement from 1802 to the Enactment of the Ten Hours Bill. London, 1857.

Lecky, W. E. H.—History of England in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1878.

Malthus.—Essay on the Principle of Population, 1872.

Martineau, Harriet.—History of the Thirty Years' Peace. London, 1878.

Orth, Samuel.—Socialism and Democracy in Europe. New York, 1913.

Owen, Robert.—Life, Written by Himself. London, 1857.

Perris, G. H.—The Industrial History of Modern England. New York, 1914.

Porter, G. R.—The Progress of the Nation, 1847.

Rogers, Thorold.—Economic Interpretation of History. New York, 1888.

Slater, Gilbert.—Making of Modern England (Revised Edition). Boston, 1915.

Smart, William.—Economic Annals of the Nineteenth Century. London, 1910.

Toynbee, Arnold.—Lectures on the Industrial Revolution, 1884.

Wallas, Graham.—The Life of Francis Place. London and New York, 1898.

Walpole, Spencer.—History of England from the End of the Great War. London, 1878.

Wesley, E. A.—Utilitarianism in England during the Nineteenth Century. London, 1902.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Journal of Education.
Arena.
Black Dwarf (1817-1818-1819).
Blackwood's Magazine.
British Quarterly Review.
Chambers' Journal.
Chronicle (The Daily).
Craftsman.
Dublin University Magazine.
Fraser.
Edinburgh Review.
Gentleman's Magazine.
Gorgon. (Was published only in 1818-1819.)
Leisure Hour.
Littell's Living Age.
London Magazine.
London Times.
Meliora.
Nation.
New Monthly Magazine.
North British Review.
Pamphleteer.
Penny Magazine.
Philanthropist. (Edited by William Allen, 1811-1813 only.)
Political Science Quarterly.
Socialist Review.
Tait's Edinburgh Review.
Westminster Review.

III. Special Bibliography upon "Child Chimney Sweeps in England," 1788-1875

PRIMARY SOURCES

Appeal to the Public by the Master Chimney Sweeps of Bristol. Bristol, 1817. (Against legislation).

Copy of the Report of the Surveyor General of the Board of Works of the Experiments made for the Purpose of Ascertaining the

Practicability of Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys by means of the Employment of Machines. Printed by the House of Commons, Feb. 1st., 1819.

Hanway, Jonas A.—A Sentimental History of Chimney Sweeps in London and Westminster shewing the Necessity of putting them under Regulations to prevent the grossest Inhumanity to the Climbing Boys. London, 1785.

Montgomery, James—The Chimney Sweepers' Friend and Climbing Boys' Album. London, 1824.

Petition of Master Sweeps of London and Westminster in favor of Proposed Bill. (1819).

Petition of Master Sweeps of London and Westminster against the Proposed Bill. (1840)

Porter, David—Considerations on the Present State of Chimney Sweepers. London, 1792.

Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children, First Report, 1863.

Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on Employment of Boys in Sweeping Chimneys, with the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee. . 1817, Vol. vi.

Reports of the Society for Superseding the Necessity of Climbing Boys. London, 1804, 1805, 1808, 1811, 1816, 1818, and others.

Steven, Robert.—Plain Hints on the Subject of Chimney Sweeping. London, 1842.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Blake, Wm. Poetical Works, Oxford Ed. 1905. (Two Little Poems on the Chimney Sweep).

Keeling, Frederic—Child Labor in the United Kingdom. London, 1914.

Kingsley, Chas.—The Water Babies. London, 1863. (The classic literary treatment of the child chimney sweep.)

IV. Special Bibliography for the Entire Field of Factory Legislation for Children. 1800 to 1853

PRIMARY SOURCES

Minutes of Evidence before the Lords' Committee to whom was referred the Bill for the Preservation of the Health and Morals of

Apprentices and others employed in Cotton Mills and Factories. 1818, vol. x.

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Lords' Committees appointed to enquire into the State and Condition of Children employed in Cotton Factories, 1819, vol. xvi.

Reports of the Factory Inspectors, 1834-1854.

Report of the Select Committee on the State of Children employed in the Manufactories of the United Kingdom, 1816, vol. iii.

Report of the Commissioners appointed to collect Information as to the Employment of Children in Factories, 1833, vols. xx and xxi, 1834, vol. xix.

Report of the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the Operation of the Act for the Regulation of Mills and Factories. 1840 vol. x, 1841, vol. ix.

Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to regulate the Labor of Children in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom, 1831-1832, vol. xv.

Report of the Children's Employment Commission, 1843, vols. xiii, and xv, 1845, vol. xliii.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aikin, John.—Description of the Country from Thirty to Forty Miles Around Manchester. London, 1795.

"Alfred," Kydd, Samuel.—History of the Factory Movement. London, 1857.

Baines, Edward, (Sr.)—Observations on the Woolen Machinery. Leeds, 1803.

Baines, Edward (Jr.)—History of the Cotton Manufacture in Great Britain. London, 1855.

Carpenter, William.—Machinery as it Affects the Industrial Classes and the Employment of Children in Factories. London. No date.

Clarke, Allen.—The Effects of the Factory System. London, 1913.

"Clothier."—Observations on the Woolen Manufacture. Leeds, 1808.

Grant, Philip.—History of Factory Legislation. Manchester, 1866.

Ludlow, J. M., and Lloyd-Jones.—The Progress of the Working Class. London, 1867.

Martineau, Harriet.—The Factory Controversy, A Warning Against Meddlesome Legislation. Manchester, 1855.

Owen, Robert.—Observations on the Manufacturing System. London, 1815.

Oastler, Richard.—The Fleet Papers. London, 1841-1843.

Percival, Dr.—Resolutions in Favor of Legislation to Protect Children Employed in Factories. Drawn up for the Manchester Board of Health, 1796.

Von Plener, Ernst.—English Factory Legislation. London, 1873.

Cooke-Taylor, W.—Factories and the Factory System. London, 1844.

Cooke-Taylor, W.—The Modern Factory System.

Webb, B. F. (Ed.).—The Case for the Factory Acts. London, 1901.

Webb, Beatrice and Sydney.—Industrial Democracy. London, 1902.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CERTAIN BILLS

The Bill of 1819

Much pamphlet literature appeared concerning this mooted legislation. Among these contributions are the following:

(A) Favorable:

1. Information of the State of Children Employed in Cotton Factories. Printed for the use of both houses of Parliament. Manchester, 1818. (This is an interesting document made up by twenty-five physicians, surgeons, and clergymen from the findings of their investigation into the condition of factory children.)

2. Observations as to the Ages of Persons employed in the Cotton Mills with Extracts of the Evidence against Sir Robert Peel's Bill. Manchester, 1819. (Refutations of the Age Limits as declared by Opponents of the Bill.)

3. Reasons in Favor of Sir Robert Peel's Bill for Ameliorating the Condition of Children employed in Cotton Factories, 1819. (A very rare and excellent document).

4. Answers to Certain Objections Made to Sir Robert Peel's Bill. Manchester, 1819.

(B) Opposed:

1. An Inquiry into the Principles and Tendencies of the Bill now pending in Parliament for Reposing certain Restrictions on the Cotton Factories. London, 1818. (This is an interesting and amusing defense, "occupation unusually healthful—data of physicians purely theoretic. Bill is founded on dangerous and alarming principle radically inconsistent with the state of society, the prosperity of a manufacturing and commercial country, and at variance with the spirit of our Constitution.") (If children of the poor allowed to play will become idle men).

2. An Examination of the Cotton Factory Question with Remarks upon two Pamphlets in Support of Sir Robert Peel's Bill. London, 1819.

THE TEN-HOUR STRUGGLE. (ARRANGED CHRONOLOGICALLY)

Cropper, Jeremy.—The Factory System. Leeds, 1831.

Robertson, John.—General Remarks on the Health of English Manufactures. London, 1831.

Bull, G. S.—A Respectful and Faithful Appeal to the Inhabitants of the Parish of Bradford on behalf of the Factory Children. Bradford, 1832.

Exposition of the Factory Question. Manchester, 1832. (Opposition.)

Kay, J. P.—The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes employed in Cotton Manufacture in Manchester. London, 1832.

Hoole, Holland.—A Letter to Lord Althorp in Defence of Factories. Manchester, 1832. (Opposition.)

Oastler, Richard.—A Letter to Mr. Holland Hoole in Reply to his Letter to Lord Althorp in Defence of the Cotton Factories of Lancashire. Manchester, 1832.

Condy, George.—An Argument for Placing Factory Children within the Pale of the Law. London, 1833.

Crabtree, Geoffrey.—The Factory Commission, The Legality of

its Appointment Questioned and the Illegality of its Proceedings Proved. London, 1833.

Finlay, Kirkman.—Letter to Lord Ashley on the Cotton Factory Question and the Ten Hours Factory Bill. Glasgow, 1833. (Opposition.)

Gaskell, P.—The Manufacturing Population of England. London, 1833.

Gaskell, P.—Prospects of Industry. London, 1835.

The Justice, Humanity, and Policy of Restricting the Hours of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom. Leeds, 1833.

Oastler, Richard.—Facts and Plain Words on Every Day Subjects. Leeds, 1833.

Oastler, Richard.—Speech delivered at a Public Meeting at Huddersfield to petition against the Acceptance of the Report of the Factory Commissioners and to pray for the Passage of a Ten Hours' Bill. Leeds, 1833.

Royle, Vernon.—The Factory System Defended. Manchester, 1833. (Opposition.)

Sadler, M. T.—Protest Against the Secret Proceedings of the Factory Commission. Leeds, 1833.

Horner, Leonard.—The Factories Regulation Act Explained. Glasgow, 1834.

Oastler, Richard.—Eight Letters to the Duke of Wellington. London, 1835.

Place, Francis.—Factory Workers and Hand Loom Weavers, the Ten Hours Bill. (In Pamphlet, edited by J. H. Roebuck.) November, 1835.)

Place, Francis.—Hand Loom Weavers and Factory Workers. London, 1835. (In pamphlet, edited by J. H. Roebuck.)

Scrope, G. P.—Two Letters. Political Economy vs. the Hand Loom Weavers with Answers to the Same. London, 1835.

Ure, Andrew.—The Philosophy of Manufacturers. London, 1835. (A paean of praise of the system and factory conditions.)

Appeal to the Members of Parliament and to the Working Classes Respecting the Ten Hours' Bill. London, 1836. (Opposition.)

Fielden, John.—The Curse of the Factory System. Halifax, 1836.

Oastler, Richard.—The Law or the Needle. London, 1836.

Oastler, Richard.—A letter to those Mill Owners who continue to oppose the Ten Hours' bill and who impudently dare to break the present Factories Act. Manchester, 1836.

Oastler, Richard.—The Rejected Letter. Leeds, 1836.

Sadler, M. T.—Factory Statistics, The Official Tables appended to the Report of the Select Committee, vindicated in a series of Letters to J. E. Drinkwater, 1836.

Statement of the Master Cotton Spinners in Support of the Factories Act Amendment Bill, 1836. (Supporting Poulett Thomson's Bill.)

A Voice from the Factories, 1836.

Thomas Wakley, A Voice from the Commons, The Factory Slave Bill, 1836.

Thomas Wakley, A Voice from the Commons, Infant Slavery Bill, 1836.

Greg, Robert H.—The Factory Question in Relation to its Effect on the Health and Morals of those employed in Factories, and the Ten-Hour Bill. London, 1837, (Opposition.)

Senior, Nassau.—Letters on the Factory Act. London, 1837.

Wing, Charles.—The Evils of the Factory System. London, 1837.

Stephens, Joseph R.—The Political Christian Pulpit. London, 1839.

Greg, S.—Two Letters to Leonard Horner on the Capabilities of the Factory System. London, 1840. (Interesting account of what he himself had accomplished for his own factory population.)

Horner, Leonard.—On the Employment of Children in Factories and other Works in the United Kingdom and some Foreign Countries, 1840.

Hyndman, H. M.—The Social Reconstruction of England. London. (No date.)

Dodd, William.—A Narrative of the Experience and Sufferings of a Factory Cripple, Written by Himself. London, 1841 (A vivid and horrible story of the effect of factory labor on a young child.)

Ashhead, Joseph.—Evidence of the State of the Laboring Classes in 1840-1842. London, 1842.

"Civis."—A Letter to Lord John Russell on the Cause of the

Distress of the Manufacturing Classes of England. London, 1842. (A plea that paper money and not factory conditions was causing the misery.)

Dodd, William.—The Factory System Illustrated in a Series of Letters to Lord Ashley. London, 1842. (A terrible picture of the physical results of factory labor for children, from data collected on a trip through the manufacturing district.)

Hudson, J. S.—Home Slavery, An Ernest Appeal on the Oppressive Effects of the Food Laws. London, 1842.

Kenworthy, William.—Inventions and Hours of Labor, 1842.

Observations on the Distressed State of Our Manufacturing Population with Proposals of an Immediate and Extensive Remedy. London, 1842. (Anti-Corn Law.)

Baines, Edward (Jr.).—The Social, Educational, and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts. London, 1843. (Opposition to Sir James Grahame's bill.)

Baines, Edward (Jr.).—The Labour Clauses of Sir James Grahame's Bill. London, 1843.

Dissenting Tactics.—A Few Hints Addressed to Members of Parliament about the Opposition to the Factories Bill. London, 1843.

Grindrod, Ralph B.—The Wrongs of Our Youth, Evils of the Late Hour System. London, 1843.

Noble, Daniel.—Facts and Observations Relative to the Influence of Manufactures upon Health and Life, 1843.

Nunns, Thomas.—A Letter to Lord Ashley on the Condition of the Working Clases in Birmingham, 1843.

Reed, Andrew.—A Speech upon the Subject of the Altered Bill. London, 1843.

Observations on the Factory System. London, 1844. (Opposition to all legislation.)

A Magistrate of Lancashire.—A Letter to Sir James Grahame on the bearing of the proposed amended Factory Bill, on Education in the Manufacturing Districts, 1844.

Torrens, R.—A Letter to Lord Ashley on the Manner and Degree in which Wages would be reduced by the Passage of a Ten-Hour Bill. London, 1844.

The Factory System and Factory Legislation. Dundee, 1846.

Barker, Joseph.—The Reformer's Almanac. Wortley, 1848.

Green, Samuel G.—Working Classes of Great Britain. London, 1849.

V. Special Bibliography on Robert Owen and New Lanark

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A complete bibliography on Robert Owen, the Socialist, issued by the National Library at Wales. Aberyswyth, 1914.

PRIMARY SOURCES

(A) Robert Owen:

An Address delivered to the Inhabitants of New Lanark on January 1, 1816, on the Opening of the Institution for the Formation of Character. London.

An Address to Mr. Owen by the inhabitants of New Lanark and his Reply. London, 1817.

Arrangements for the Distressed Working Classes—In Three Letters to David Ricardo. London, 1819.

Articles of Agreement drawn up and Recommended by the London Cooperative Society, 1825.

Cooperative Magazine and Monthly Herald. London, 1826. New Series, 1827.

The Crisis, Edited by Robert Owen and Robert Dale Owen, 1832.

The Economist, A Periodical Paper projected by Robert Owen. London, 1821.

The Gazette of the Exchange Bazars, 1832.

A Full Account of the Farewell Festival given to Robert Owen, Esq., on his Departure for America. London, 1844.

Journal, London, 1851.

Letter to British Master Manufacturers on the Employment of Children in Manufactories. March 30, 1818.

Life of Robert Owen. London, 1857.

Mr. Owen's System as Developed in a Public Lecture delivered by himself at the Freemason's Hall, September, 1830. Reported from the "Star."

The New Existence of Man upon Earth. London, 1854-1855.

New View of Society or Essays on the Formation of the Human Character. London, 1818. (First Ed. of First essay, 1813.)

Observations on the Cotton Trade with a View to the Intended Application to Parliament for a Repeal on the Duties on the Importation of Cotton Wool. Glasgow Chronicle, January 27, 1815.

Observation on the Effect of the Manufacturing System. London, 1815.

The Orbiston Register. (Not all the work of Owen.)

Public Discussion between Robert Owen and J. H. Roebuck. Manchester, 1837.

Rational Quarterly Review and Journal. London, 1853.

Report of the Proceedings at the Several Public Meetings. Dublin, 1823.

Report to the Committee of the Association for the Relief of the Manufacturing and Laboring Poor, Laid before the Committee of the House on the Poor Laws, 1816.

Report to the County of Lanark on a Plan for Relieving Public Distress and Removing Discontent. London, 1832.

The Reporter's Report of Robert Owen's May Meetings in London, 1858.

The Revolution in the Mind and Practice of the Human Race. London, 1849.

Series of Tracts Published by the Universal Community Society of Rational Religionists. No date.

Statements showing the Power that Ireland Possesses to Create Wealth. London, 1823.

OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

Robert Owen at New Lanark, by One Formerly a Teacher at New Lanark. Manchester, 1839.

Owen, Robert Dale.—An Outline of the System of Education at New Lanark. Glasgow, 1824.

Owen, Robert Dale.—Threading my Way (Autobiography). New York, 1874.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Balmforth, Ramsden.—Social and Political Pioneers. London, 1900.

Bentham, Jeremy.—Works (Bowring Edition). Edinburgh, 1843.

Booth, A. J.—Robert Owen, The Founder of Socialism in England. London, 1869.

Griscom, John.—A Year in Europe. New York, 1824.

Hutchin, B. L.—Fabian Tract Number 166. London, 1912.

Lloyd-Jones.—Life, Times, and Labors of Robert Owen. London, 1889.

Martineau, Harriet.—Biographical Sketches. New York, 1869.

Packard, F. A.—Life of Robert Owen. Philadelphia, 1866.

Podmore, Frank.—Life of Owen. London, 1906. (An exhaustive and entertaining biography.)

Report of the Proceedings of the Festival in Commemoration of the Centenary Birthday of Robert Owen. London, 1871.

Sargant, William L.—Robert Owen and His Social Philosophy, 1860.

Simon, Helene.—Robert Owen, sein Leben und seine Bedeutung für die Gegenwart. Jena, 1905.

PERIODICALS

Annual of the Cooperative Wholesale Societies Limited. Manchester and Glasgow, 1903.

CRITICISM (CONTEMPORARY)

Aiton, John.—A Refutation of Mr. Owen's System. London, 1818.

Brown, John.—Remarks on the Plans and Publications of Robert Owen, Esq. Edinburgh, 1817.

An Examination of Mr. Robert Owen's Doctrines of Human Responsibility. London. No date.

MacConnell, Thomas.—Signs of the Times. London, 1832..

McNab, Henry Grey, M.D.—The New Views of Mr. Owen of Lanark. London, 1819.

Mr. Owen's Proposed Arrangements for the Distressed Working Classes as Consistent with Sound Principles of Political Economy. London, 1819.

A "Lover of Truth," Observations on the Critique in the Edinburgh Review of October, 1819, of Mr. Owen's plans for Relieving National Distress. Edinburgh, 1819.

Observations upon Currency and Finance (By a Looker-on). Philadelphia, 1826.

Remarks on the Practicability of Mr. Owen's plan to Improve the Condition of the Lower Classes. London, 1819.

A View and Review of Robert Owen's Projects or the Manspel, according to Robert Owen, criticised by the Gospel according to Richard Carlile, 1838.

A Report of the British and Foreign Philanthropic Society with Statements and Calculations of Mr. Owen's Plan for the Relief of Ireland. Dublin, 1823.

VI. Special Bibliography of The Emancipation of Women and Girls from Mines and Collieries

PRIMARY SOURCES

Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children in Mines, 1842. Vols. xv, xvi, xvii.

Report of the Commissioners Appointed under the Provisions of the Act of 5 and 6 Victoria, c. 99, to Inquire into the Operation of That Act, 1844. Vol. xvi.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Horner, Leonard.—On the Employment of Children in Factories and Other Works, 1840.

Scott, J.—An Earnest Address and Urgent Appeal to the People of England in Behalf of the Oppressed and Suffering Pitmen of the Counties of Northumberland and Durham, 1831.

Physical and Moral Condition of the Children and Young People Employed in Mines and Manufactures. London, 1843. (Made up of extracts from the reports of the Commissioners.)

Note: There is very little literature except the Parliamentary Sources on the subject of this legislation. That is probably accounted for by the fact that the conditions could not be defended with any success, and that Parliamentary action was unusually prompt, the bill prohibiting the employment of women and girls in the Mines, having been passed in exactly two years from the time the subject was first brought up in Parliament by Lord Ashley.

VII. Special Bibliography on "Newgate Prison Schools and their Development"

PRIMARY SOURCES

Allen, William.—Journal, London, 1846.

Buxton, Sir Thomas Fowell.—An Enquiry whether Crime and Misery are produced or prevented by our present System of Prison Discipline. London, 1818.

Fox, George.—Journal, London, 1852.

Forster, William.—Memoirs, edited by Benjamin Seebohm. London, 1865.

Fry, Elizabeth.—Memoir of the life of, with Extracts from her Journal, edited by her Daughters. London, 1847.

Fry, Elizabeth.—Hints on the Advantages and the Duties of Ladies Committees who visit Prisons. London, 1840.

Fry, Elizabeth, and Gurney, J. J.—Report on Prisons and Insane Asylums in Ireland. No date. (Probably about 1821.)

Grellet, Stephen.—Memoirs, edited by Benjamin Seebohm. Philadelphia, 1867.

Griffiths, Arthur.—Chronicles of Newgate. London, 1884.

Gurney, Joseph J., and Fry, Elizabeth.—Notes on a Visit made to some of the Prisons of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1819.

Howard, John.—State of Prisons in England and Wales with preliminary observations and an Account of some Foreign Prisons. London, 1784 (?).

Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on the State of the Prisons of the Metropolis, 1818. Vol. viii. p. 297.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aiken, John.—A View of the Life, Travels, and Philanthropic Labors of the late John Howard. Boston, 1794.

Adams, Elmer C., and Foster, Warren D.—Heroines of Modern Progress. New York, 1913.

Ashby, Irene.—Elizabeth Fry. London, 1892.

Bliss, William (Editor), Encyclopedia of Social Reform. New York, 1908.

A Brief Memoir of Elizabeth Fry. Philadelphia, 1860.

Biographical Sketch of Elizabeth Fry. London, 1863.

Binney, T.—Life of Sir Thomas Fowel Buxton. London, 1853.

Braithwaite, William.—The Beginnings of Quakerism. London, 1912.

Brailsford, Mabel.—Quaker Women. London, 1915.

Corder, Susanna.—Life of Elizabeth Fry. London, 1853.

Dixon, H.—John Howard and the Prison World of Europe. London, 1850.

Field, J.—Life of John Howard. London, 1850.

Elizabeth Fry, The Philanthropist. Philadelphia, 1851.

Gough, John.—The History of the People called Quakers. Dublin, 1789.

Gurney, Joseph J.—Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends. Philadelphia, 1825.

Holmes, Marion.—A Cameo Life Sketch of Elizabeth Fry. London, 1911.

Lewis, Georgina King.—Elizabeth Fry. London, 1912.

Owen, Robert.—New Existence of Man upon Earth. London, 1854-1855.

Owen, Robert.—New View of Society or Essays on the Formation of the Human Character. London, 1818.

Penn, William.—Letter to his Wife and Children. London, 1822.

Pitman (Mrs.), E. R.—Life of Elizabeth Fry. Boston, 1886.

Render, William H.—Through Prison Bars. London. No date.

Timpson, Thomas.—Memoir of Mrs. Elizabeth Fry. London, 1847.

Wakefield, E. G.—Facts relating to the Punishment of Death in the Metropolis. London, 1832.

Note: No biography of Mrs. Fry is valuable but that edited by her daughters, that of Susanna Corder, and that of Thomas Timpson.

VIII. Special Bibliography on "Anglican Promotion of Education for the Children of the Poor in the Nineteenth Century—Its Antecedents, Its Interpretation, and Its Setting"

Primary Sources

Anniversary Sermons and Reports of the Charity Schools be-

longing to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1707-1816. 19 vols.

Brougham, Henry.—A Letter to Sir Samuel Romilly upon the Abuse of Charities. London, 1818.

Brougham, Henry.—Practical Observations on Popular Education. London, 1825.

Chalmers, Thomas.—Considerations on the System of Parochial Schools in Scotland. Glasgow, 1819.

Coleridge, Sara.—Memoirs and Letters. London, 1873.

Digest of Returns to Circulars from the Committee on the State of Education among the lower Orders in the Metropolis, 1819, ix.

Fox, Joseph.—Vindication of Mr. Lancaster's System of Education. London, 1832.

Francke, August Herman.—Pietas Hallensis (Translation). New York, 1868.

General Table Showing State of Education in England, 1820 (Par. Paper), xii.

Hook, Walter Farquhar.—A Letter to the Bishop of St. David's. London, 1846.

Mandeville, Bernard de.—The Fable of the Bees. London, 1772.

Marsh, Herbert.—A Vindication of Mr. Bell's System of Tuition in a Series of Letters. London, 1811.

Minutes of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1698-1704. Edited by Edmund McClure.

Parliamentary Papers, 1839, xli, 1840, xl.

Reports of Commissioners for Investigation into Educational Charities, per Acts 58 George III, c. 91 and 59 George III, c. 81, 1819-1840 (38 folios).

Reports from the Select Committee on the state of Education among the Lower Orders, 1816, iv—1817, iii—1818, iv.

Romilly, Samuel.—Life written by himself with Selections from his Correspondence and Diary. London, 1842.

Statement, Letters, and Memorial addressed to the Incorporated National Society. London, 1848.

Vincent, William.—A Defense of Public Education. London, 1802.

Watts, Isaac.—An Essay toward the Encouragement of Charity Schools, particularly those Supported by Protestant Dissenters. London, 1728.

Whately, Richard.—The Duty of Those who Disapprove of the Education of the Poor. London, 1830.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, Francis.—History of the Elementary School Contest in England. London, 1882.

Adamson, John William.—Pioneers of Modern Education. Cambridge, 1905.

Allen, W. O. B., and McClure, Edmund.—Two Hundred Years of the History of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898. London, 1898.

Bartley, G. C. T.—The Schools for the People. London, 1871.

Bell, Andrew.—Complete Works. Edinburgh, 1832.

Bell, Andrew.—Manual of Public and Private Education. London, 1827.

Bernard, Sir Thomas.—The New School. London, 1810.

Bentley, Joseph.—State of Education, Crime, etc., London, 1842.

Binns, Henry Bryan.—A Century of Education. London, 1908.

Bowles, W. L.—Life of Thomas Ken. London, 1831.

Braithwaite, William C.—The Beginnings of Quakerism. London, 1912.

Cambridge Modern History, 1909.

Chance, William.—Children under the Poor Law. London, 1897.

Graves, F. P.—A History of Education in Modern Times. New York, 1913.

Greenough, James C.—The Evolution of the Elementary Schools of Great Britain. New York, 1903.

Gregory, Robert.—Elementary Education. London, 1895.

Hall, Thomas C.—The Evangelical Revival and Philanthropy. London, 1910.

Harris, J. H.—Robert Raikes and his Work. London, 1899.

Highmore, A.—The History, Design, and Present State of the Various Public Charities in and near London. London, 1814.

Hole, Charles.—A Manual of English Church History. London, 1910.

Holman, H.—English National Education. London, 1898.

Lancaster, Joseph.—Improvements in Education. London, 1803. Abridged Edition, 1808.

Lecky, W. E. H.—History of England in the Eighteenth Century. New York, 1878.

McGiffert, Arthur Cushmen.—Protestant Thought before Kant. New York, 1911.

Malcolm, J. P.—Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London. London, 1810.

Meiklejohn, J. M. D.—An Old Educational Reformer. Edinburgh, 1881.

De Montmorency, J. E. G.—The Progress of Education in England. London, 1904.

De Montmorency, J. E. G.—State Intervention in English Education. Cambridge, 1902.

More, Hannah.—Works. London, 1818.

Morley, John.—The Struggle for National Education. London, 1873.

Plummer, Alfred.—The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1910.

Salmon, David.—The Education of the Poor in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1908.

Salmon, David.—Joseph Lancaster. London, 1904.

Shuttleworth, James P. Kay.—Four Periods of Public Education. London, 1862.

Shuttleworth, J. P. Kay.—Public Education. London, 1853.

Southey, Robert.—Life of Andrew Bell. London, 1844.

VITA

ISABEL SIMERAL, born Dec. 10th 1880. Graduated from Illinois State Normal, 1902. Ph. B. University of Chicago, 1905. Head of Department of History, High School, Bloomington, Ill, 1905-1910. M. A. Columbia, 1911. Teacher of History, Hunter College, New York City, 1912-1914. Superintendent of the United Charities, Los Angeles, Cal., 1914-1915. Executive Secretary of the Municipal Charities Commission, Los Angeles, Cal., 1915.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

4,232

HV 751 .A6 S5 1916

Simeral

Reform
of chil

DATE DUE

DEMCO
PAMPHLET BINDER
Gray Pressboard

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HV751.A6 S5 1916
Simeral, Isab Reform movements in behalf
3 0645 0005 2421 1